

Պատմական աղբիւրների ուսումնասիրութիւնք եւ նման հայագիտականք



Studies of Armenian Historical Sources and Similar *Armeniaca* at Internet Archive

Prepared by Robert G. Bedrosian

Additional information on the historical sources and their authors is available on other resource guides at this website: [Armenian Historical Sources](#); in the Introductions/Prefaces of translations done by Langlois and Brosset on the [Reference Works](#) page; and from the online table [Armenian Writers of the 5th-13th Centuries](#).

Ագաթանգեղոս/Agat'angheos

Barsegh Sargisyan, [Ագաթանգեղոս եւ իւր բազմադարեան գաղտնիքն Agat'angheghos ew iwr bazmadarean gaghtnik'n](#) [[Agat'angheghos and His Centuries-Long Secret](#)] (Vienna, 1890), in 447 pdf pages.

Yakovbos Tashean, [Ագաթանգեղոս առ Գեորգայ ասորի եպիսկոպոսին եւ ուսումնասիրութիւն Ագաթանգեղեայ գրոց Agat'angheghos ar' Ge'orgay asori episkoposin ew usumnasirut'iwn Agat'angegheay grots'](#) [[Agat'angheghos according to Ge'org the Assyrian Bishop, and a Study of Agat'angheghos' Writings](#)] (Venice, 1891). *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 3, in 185 pdf pages.

Nicholas Marr, [Սկրտութիւն հայոց, վրաց, աբխազաց եւ ալանաց ի սրբոյն Գրիգորէ Մկրտ'իւն հայոց', vrats', abkhazats' ew alانات' i srboyn Grigore'](#) [[The Baptism of the Armenians, Georgians, Abkhazes, and Alans by Saint Gregory](#)], Armenian translation of the Russian original (Vagharshapat, 1911), in 153 pdf pages.

Nicholas Adontz, [Grégoire l'Illuminateur et Anak le Parthe](#), from the journal *Revue des études arméniennes* 8(1928), pp. 233-245. This important article was published in French and in Armenian the same year [[Գրիգոր Լուսավորիչ և Անակ Պարթև/Grigor Lusavorich' ev Anak Part'ev](#)]. The download contains both.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Ագաթանգեղոս Agat'angeghos**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn* [History of Ancient Armenian Literature], vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 163-173](#), in 11 pdf pages.

K. Melik-Ohanjanyan, [Ագաթանգեղոսի բանահյուսական աղբյուրների հարցի շուրջը Agat'angeghosi banahyusakan aghbyurneri harts'i shurje"](#) [On the Question of Agat'angeghos' Folkloric Sources], from *Patma-banasirakan handes* [Historico-Philological Journal], 4(1964), pp. 53-82, in 30 pdf pages.

Albert Musheghyan, ["Ագաթանգեղոսի պատմությունը", ստեղծման հանգամանքները, գրության ժամանակը և հեղինակի հարցը Agat'angeghosi patmut'yune", steghtsman hangamank'nere", grut'yan zhamanake" ev heghinaki harts'e"](#) [Agat'angeghos' History: Circumstances of Its Creation, Time of Its Writing, and the Question of Its Author], from *Patma-banasirakan handes* [Historico-Philological Journal], 1(2012), pp. 196-222, in 27 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Ագաթանգեղոս Agat'angeghos**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn* [History of Ancient Armenian Literature] (Venice, 1897), [pp. 202-234](#), in 33 pdf pages.

Կորիւն/Koriwn

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Կորիւն Koriwn**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn* [History of Ancient Armenian Literature] (Venice, 1897), [pp. 310-314](#), in 5 pdf pages.

Norayr N. Biwandats'i, [Կորիւն եւ Լորիւն թարգմանութիւնը Koriwn ew norin t'argmanut'iwnk'](#) [Koriwn and His Translations] (Tiflis, 1900), in 603 pdf pages. Several pages missing from the Foreword.

Hracheay Acharean/Acharyan/Adjarian:

[Ս. Մեսրոբի եւ գրերու գիտի պատմութեան աղբիւրներն ու անոնց քննութիւնը S. Mesrobi ew greru giwti patmut'ean aghbiwrnarn u anonts' k'nnut'iwnne"](#) [Sources for the History of Saint Mesrob and the Discovery of the Alphabet, and Their Criticism] (Paris, 1907), in 59 pdf pages.

[Հայերէն Լոր քառեր Լորագիտ Մնացորդաց գրոց մէջ Hayere'n nor bar'er noragiw Mnats'ordats' grots' me'j.](#) [New Armenian Words in the Newly-Discovered Book of Chronicles] (Vienna, 1908), in 57 pdf pages. Azgayin matenadaran series, volume 56.

Nicholas Adontz:

[Անծանօթ էջեր Մաշթոցի եւ Լորա աշակերտների կեանքից ըստ օտար աղբիւրների Antsano't' e'jer Masht'ots'i ew nra ashakertneri keank'its' e"st o'tar aghbiwrneri](#) [Unknown Pages from the Life of Mashtots and His Students according to Foreign Sources], article from the journal *Hande's Amso'reay* 39(1925), columns 193-202, 321-328, 435-441, 531-539, in 18 pdf pages.

[Կորիւնի մասին Koriwni masin](#) [Regarding Koriwn], article from the journal *Hande's Amso'reay* 41(1927), columns 273-284, 395-405, in 14 pdf pages.

[Դարձեալ Կորիւնի շուրջը Dardzeal Koriwni shurje"](#) [Once More on Koriwn], article from the journal *Hande's Amso'reay* 42(1928), columns 76-94, in 11 pdf pages.

Josef Markwart, [Ueber den Ursprung des armenischen Alphabets in Verbindung mit der Biographie des heil. Mastoc](#) (Vienna, 1917), in 76 pdf pages.

Armenian translation of the above: [Պատմութիւն հայերէն նշանագրերու եւ վարուց ս. Մաշթոցի Patmut'iwn hayere'n nshanagraru ew varuts' s. Masht'ots'i](#) [The History of Armenian Characters and the Life of St. Mashtots'], translated by A. Vardanean

(Vienna, 1913), in 83 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 68. Curiously, the Armenian translation was published before Markwart's German original which was delayed from its projected publication date of 1912.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Կորիւն Koriwn**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn* [History of Ancient Armenian Literature], vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 155-173](#), in 19 pdf pages.

K. Melik-Ohanjanyan, ["Վարք Մաշտոցի" ժանրը և պատմագրական նշանակությունը "Vark' Mashtots'i" zhanre" ev patmagrakan nshanakut'yune"](#) [The Life of Mashtots' Genre and Its Historiographical Significance], from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 7 (1964), pp. 49-59, in 12 pdf pages.

Abraham Terian, [Koriwn's Life of Mashtots' as an Encomium](#), from *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 3(1987), pp. 1-14, in 14 pdf pages.

O. Vardazaryan, ["Վարք Մաշտոցի" երկու սրբագրումները եւ Ղազար Փարպեցու վկայությունը "Vark' Mashtots'i" erku srbagrurnere" ew Ghazar P'arpets'u vkayut'yune"](#) [Two Corrections in the Life of Mashtots' and the Testimony of Ghazar P'arpets'i], from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 18 (2008), pp. 41-57, in 17 pdf pages.

Փաւստոս/P'awstos

Hovsep Gat'rchean, [Փաւստոս Բիւզանդացի P'awstos Biwzandats'i](#), an influential article from the journal *Hande's Amso'reay* 3(Vienna, 1889), pp. 40-43, in 4 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Buzand**, from *Հայկական հին դպրութեան պատմութիւն Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn* [History of Ancient Armenian Literature] (Venice, 1897), [pp. 361-374](#), in 15 pdf pages.

Y. Daghashean, [Փ. Բիւզանդացի եւ իւր պատմութեան խառնախտոր. Խորենացու աղբիւրների ուսումնասիրութիւն P'. Biwzandats'i ew iwr patmut'ean xardaxoghe". Xorenats'u aghbiwrneri usumnasirut'iwn](#) [P'. Biwzandats'i and the Corrupter of His History. A Study of Xorenats'i's Sources] (Vienna, 1898), in 188 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 29.

Grigor Ter-Poghosian, [Նկատողութիւններ Փաւստոսի պատմութեան վերաբերեալ Nkatoghut'iwnner P'awstosi patmut'ean verabereal](#) [Observations on P'awstos' History] (Venice, 1901). *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 38, in 142 pdf pages.

Nicholas Adontz, [Փաւստոս Բուզանդը որպէս պատմիչ P'avstos Buzande" orpes patmich' \[P'awstos Buzand as a Historian\]](#), in 50 pdf pages. The article was published initially in Russian in the journal *Khristianskii Vostok* VI(1922). This Armenian translation, by V. A. Diloyan, appears on pp. 87-130 of *Works of Nicholas Adontz in Five Volumes* [in Armenian], Volume 2 (Erevan, 2006), P. H. Hovhannisyan, editor.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Փաւստոս Բուզանդ P'awstos Buzand**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn* [History of Ancient Armenian Literature], vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 173-180](#), and Appendix 3, [pp. 623-625](#), P'. Buzandi Hayots' patmut'ean ar'ajin ew erkrord dprut'iwnneri xndire" [The Question of the First and Second Books of P'. Buzand's History of the Armenians], in 12 pdf pages.

Stepanos Malxasyants', [Ներածություն Neratsut'yun](#) [Introduction], to his Modern Armenian translation of P'awstos entitled *P'avstos Buzand, Patmut'yun hayots'* [History of the Armenians by P'avstos Buzand] (Erevan, 1968), pp. 1-61.

Stepanos Malxasyants', [Ներշապուհ "Ռմբոսեան" և "Բուզանդարան" պատմութիւնը բառերի մեկնությունը Nershapuh "R'mbosean" ev "Buzandaran" patmut'iwnk' bar'eri meknut'yune"](#) [An Explantion of the Words Nershapuh "R'mbosean" and "Buzandaran" Patmut'iwnk'], from *Teghekakir* 4(1947), pp. 91-93, in 3 pdf pages.

Anahit Perikhanian, [Sur arménien buzand](#), from *Armenian Studies in Memoriam Haig Berberian* (Lisbon, 1986), Dickran Kouymjian, editor, pp. 653-657, in 6 pdf pages.

Rafik Nahapetyan, [Ազգագրական տեղեկություններ Փավստոս Բուզանդի "Հայոց պատմություն" երկում](#) *Azgagrakan teghekut'yunner P'avstos Buzandi "Hayots' patmut'yun" erkum* [*Ethnographic Information in P'awstos Buzand's Work History of the Armenians*], from *Patma-banasirakan handes* [*Historico-Philological Journal*], 1(2013), pp. 85-103, in 19 pdf pages.

Եզնիկ/Eznik

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Եզնիկ Eznik**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*] (Venice, 1897), [pp. 300-309](#), in 10 pdf pages.

Grigoris Gale'mk'earean, [Լորագոյն աղբերք Եզնկայ Կողպացոյ Ընդդէմ աղանոց մատենին](#) *Noragoyñ aghberk' Eznkay Koghpat's'woy E'ndde'm aghandots' matenin* [*Newest Sources for Eznik of Kogh's Book Against the Sects*] (Venice, 1919), in 154 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 83.

Nicholas Adontz, [Քննական նշմարներ Եզնիկի մասին](#) *K'nnakan nshmarner Ezniki masin* [*Critical Observations on Eznik*], in 43 pdf pages. A critique of L. Maries' *Le de Deo d'Eznik de Kolb*. This article originally appeared serialized in the journal *Bazmave'p* in 1926-1926. Reprinted on pp. 131-168 of *Works of Nicholas Adontz in Five Volumes* [in Armenian], Volume 2 (Erevan, 2006), P. H. Hovhannisyan, editor.

M. Xostikean, [Ազգագրական սիւրբեր Եզնիկի "Եդն աղանոց" երկի մէջ](#) *Azgagrakan niwt'er Ezniki "Eghis aghandots'" erkri me'j* [*Ethnographic Materials in Eznik's Work Against the Sects*], in 11 pdf pages, from *Azgagrakan Hande's* [*Ethnographic Review*], XXVI (1916), pp. 137-147.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Եզնիկ Eznik**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*], vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 130-169](#), in 40 pdf pages.

Rev. Father Zaven Vardapet Arzoumanian, [The Refutation of the Sects by Eznik of Kolb](#), from *Studies in Armenian Historiography* (New York, 1976), pp. 1-14, in 15 pdf pages.

Փարպեցի/P'arpets'i

Grigor Xalatean/Xalateants', [Ղազար Փարպեցի եւ գործք Լորին](#) *Ghazar P'arpets'i ew gortsk' norin* [*Ghazar P'arpets'i and His Works*] (Moscow, 1883), in 157 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Ղազար Փարպեցի Ghazar P'arpets'i**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*] (Venice, 1897), [pp. 391-406](#), in 16 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Ղազար Փարպեցի Ghazar P'arpets'i**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*], vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 326-359](#), in 35 pdf pages.

Archbishop N. Bogharian, [Լորագյուտ հատված Ղազար Փարպեցու "Հայոց Պատմութեան"](#) *Noragyut hatvats Ghazar P'arpets'u "Hayots' Patmut'ean"* [*A Newly-Discovered Fragment from Ghazar P'arpets'i's History of the Armenians*], from *Banber Matenadaran*, volume 8 (1967), pp. 263-274, in 12 pdf pages.

M. Minasyan, [Մեյեի դիտողությունները Փարպեցու Թորթի և Եղիշեի երրորդ գլխի վերաբերյալ](#) *Meyei ditoghut'yunnere' P'arpets'u T'ght'i ev Eghishei errord glxi veraberyal* [*Meillet's Observations on P'arpets'i's Letter and the Third Chapter of Eghishe*], from *Banber Matenadaran*, volume 9 (1969), pp. 49-58, in 10 pdf pages.

[Ղազար Փարպեցու Պատմության նորահայտ պատառիկը Ghazar P'arpets'u Patmut'yan norahayt patar'ike](#)" [*The Newly-Discovered Fragment of Ghazar P'arpets'i's History*], by P. Muradyan and K. Yuzbashyan/Պ. Մուրադյան, Կ Յուզբաշյան, from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 11 (1973), pp. 7-32, in 26 pdf pages.

[Ղազար Փարպեցի \[Ghazar P'arpets'i\]](#), by K. Yuzbashyan, from *Patma-banasirakan handes [Historico-Philological Journal]*, 4(1983), pp. 179-193, in 15 pdf pages.

Pseudo-Callisthenes' *Life of Alexander* (belles lettres)

Yakovbos Tashean, [Ուսումնասիրությունը ստոյն-Կալիսթենեայ վարուց Ալեքսանդրի Usumnasirut'iwnk' stoy'n-Kalist'eneay varuts' Aghek'sandri \[Studies of Pseudo-Callisthenes' Life of Alexander\]](#) (Vienna, 1892), in 297 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 5.

Եղիշե/Eghishe'

Vardan Hats'uni, [Խորհրդածությունը Եղիշեի պատմության վերայ Xorhrdatsut'iwnk' Eghishe'i patmut'ean veray \[Reflections on Eghishe's History\]](#) (Venice, 1896), in 305 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Եղիշե Eghishe'**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 334-349](#), in 16 pdf pages.

Babgen Kiwle'se'rean:

[Եղիշե. քննական ուսումնասիրություն Eghishe', k'nnakan usumnasirut'iwn \[Eghishe', a Critical Study\]](#) (Vienna, 1909), in 507 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 57.

[Քաջն-Վարդան K'ajn-Vardan](#) (Boston, 1920), in 195 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Եղիշե Eghishe'**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 305-325](#), in 21 pdf pages.

V. Arakelyan, [Եղիշեի Վարդանանց պատմությունը \(Ե. Տեր-Մինասյանի թարգմանության առթիվ\) Eghishei Vardanants' patmut'yune" \(E. Ter-Minasyani t'argmanut'yan ar'tiv\) \[Eghishe's History of the Vardanants' \(on the Occasion of E. Ter-Minasyan's Translation\)\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 3 (1956), pp. 203-217, in 16 pdf pages.

E. Ter-Minasyan, [Վերջին անգամ Ն. Ակինյանն ու Եղիշեի "Վարդանանց Պատմությունը" Verjin angam N. Akinyann u Eghishei Vardanants' Patmut'yune" \[For the Last Time about N. Akinean and Eghishe's History of the Vardanants'\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 5 (1960), pp. 527-533, in 8 pdf pages.

B. L. Zekiyani, [Քննադատական դիտարկումներ Եղիշեի ընծայված գրական ստեղծագործության ամբողջության վերաբերյալ K'nnadatakan ditarkumner Eghishei e"ntsayvats grakan steghtsagortsut'yan amboghjut'yan veraberyal \[Critical Observations on Eghishe's Complete Creative Works\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 17 (2006), pp. 79-146, in 68 pdf pages.

A. Banuch'yan, [Եղիշեի Վարդանանց պատերազմի նորահայտ պատառիկները Eghishei Vardanants' paterazmi norahayt patar'iknere" \[Newly-Discovered Fragments of Eghishe's Vardanants' War\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 17 (2006), pp. 261-287, in 28 pdf pages.

A. Banuch'yan, [Եղիշեի Վարդանանց պատերազմի հնագույն պատառիկի նոր վերծանությունը Eghishei Vardanants' paterazmi hnaguyn patar'iki nor vertsanut'yune" \[A New Analysis of the Oldest Fragment of Eghishe's Vardanants' War\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 18 (2008), pp. 217-257, in 42 pdf pages.

Դավիթ Անյաղթ/Dawit' Anyaght'

[Mémoire sur la vie et les ouvrages de David](#)...et principalement sur ses traductions de quelques écrits d'Aristote, by Karl Friedrich Neumann (Paris, 1829), in 96 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Դավիթ Անյաղթ Dawit' Anyaght'**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*] (Venice, 1897), [pp. 314-324](#), in 11 pdf pages.

[Der Philosoph David in der armenischen Überlieferung](#), by Missak Khostikian (Bern, 1907), in 88 pdf pages.

[Դավիթ Հարքացի անյաղթ փիլիսոփայ Dawit' Hark'ats'i anyaght' p'ilisop'ay](#) [*The Invincible Philosopher Dawit' of Hark'*], by Nerses Akinean (Vienna, 1959), in 208 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 186.

[David Anaght', the 'Invincible' Philosopher](#), Avedis K. Sanjian, editor (Atlanta, Georgia, 1986), in 159 bookmarked and searchable pdf pages. This is a collection of scholarly articles about the life and works of the 6th-7th century Armenian Neoplatonist philosopher Dawit' *anyaght'*/David the Invincible.

Սեբեոս/Sebeos, and the Primary History of Armenia

G. V. Abgaryan:

Առաջաբան Ar'ajaban [Foreword], to Abgaryan's critical edition, *Sebe'osi Patmut'iwn* (Erevan, 1979), [pp. 5-43](#), in 39 pdf pages.

[Մամիկոնյանների զրույցի հնագույն աղբյուրը հայ մատենագրության մեջ Mamikonyanneri zruyts'i hnaguyn aghbyure" hay matenagrut'yan mej](#) [*The Oldest Source in Armenian Literature for the Story of the Mamikonians*], from *Banber Matenadaran*, volume 7 (1964), pp. 237-269, in 34 pdf pages.

[Դարձյալ Սեբեոսի մասին Dardzyal Sebeosi masin](#) [*Again on Sebeos*], from *Banber Matenadaran*, volume 10 (1971), pp. 425-474, in 50 pdf pages.

X. T'orosyan, [Սեբեոս Պատմիչը և նրա երկը Sebeos Patmich'e" ev nra erke"](#) [*The Historian Sebeos and His Work*], from *Banber Matenadaran*, volume 9 (1969), pp. 59-100, in 42 pdf pages.

Nerses Akinean/Akinian, [Սեբիոս եպիսկոպոս Բագրատունեաց եւ իւր պատմութիւնն ի Հերակղ Sebios episkopos Bagratuneats' ew iwr patmut'iwnn i Herakgh](#) [*Sebios, Bishop of the Bagratuni, and His History of Heraclius*], from the journal *Hande's Amso'reay* (1923), cols. 1-9, 97-105, 220-227, 328-341, 396-420, in 38 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Սեբեոս Sebeos**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*] vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 408-419](#), in 12 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Սեբեոս Sebeos**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*] (Venice, 1897), [pp. 435-441](#), in 7 pdf pages.

St. Malxaseants', [Սեբեոսի պատմութիւնը եւ Ս. Խորենացի Sebe'osi patmut'iwne" ew M. Xorenats'i](#) [*Sebeos' History and M. Xorenats'i*] (Tiflis, 1899), in 161 pdf pages.

[Март и Адонц о начальной истории Армении \[Marr and Adontz on the Primary History of Armenia\]](#), in 91 pdf pages. This download contains two Russian-language articles from the journal *Vizantiiskii Vremennik* about the six chapters appended to the beginning of **Sebeos' History** and called **The Primary History of Armenia** or **The Anonymous of Sebeos**. Included are Nicholas Marr's *O nachal'noi istorii Armenii Anonima* [*On the Anonymous Primary History of Armenia*] from VV 1(1894) and Nicholas Adontz' *Nachal'naia istorii Armenii u Sebeosa v' eia otnosheniakh k' trudam' Moiseia Khorenskago i*

Fausta Vizantiiskago [*The Primary History of Armenia in Sebeos in Connection with the Works of Movses Xorenats'i and P'awstos Buzand*] from VV 8(1901).

Also available: [Հայոց նախնական պատմությունը Hayots' naxnakan patmut'yune"...](#) Adontz' aforementioned article, translated into Armenian by V. A. Diloyan, and published in 57 pdf pages in *Works of Nicholas Adontz in Five Volumes* [in Armenian], Volume 2 (Erevan, 2006), P. H. Hovhannisyanyan, editor, pp. 243-293.

[Անանունը կամ Կեղծ-Սեբեոս, քննական ուսումնասիրություն Ananune" kam Keghts-Sebe'os, k'nnakan usumnasirut'iwn](#) [*The Anonymous or Pseudo-Sebeos, Critical Study*], by A. Matikéan (Vienna, 1913), in 114 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 70.

Robert H. Hewsen, "[The Primary History of Armenia": An Examination of the Validity of an Immemorially Transmitted Historical Tradition](#)", in 11 pdf pages. From *History in Africa*, Vol. 2 (1975), pp. 91-100.

Անանիա Շիրակացի/Anania Shirakats'i

S. Hayrapetyan, [Անանիա Շիրակացու կյանքն ու գործունեությունը Anania Shirakats'u kyank'n u gortsuneut'yune"](#) [*Anania Shirakat'si's Life and Works*], from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 1 (1941), pp. 1-17, in 17 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Անանիա Շիրակացի Anania Shirakats'i**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*], vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 393-408](#), in 16 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Անանիա Շիրակացի Anania Shirakats'i**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*] (Venice, 1897), [pp. 456-465](#), in 10 pdf pages.

Suren T. Eremyan, [Հայաստանը ըստ Աշխարհացոյց-ի Hayastane" e"st Ashxarhats'oyts'-i](#) [*Armenia according to the Ashxarhats'oyts'*] (Erevan, 1963), with map, in 155 pdf pages.

See also: [Selected Writings of Suren T. Eremyan](#).

Robert H. Hewsen, [Science in Seventh-Century Armenia: Ananias of Širak](#), from *Isis*, Vol. 59, No. 1 (Spring, 1968), pp. 32-45, in 15 pdf pages.

A. G. Abrahamyan and G. B. Petrosyan, [Անանիա Շիրակացի Մատենագրություն Anania Shirakats'i Matenagrut'yun](#) [*Writings of Anania of Shirak*] (Erevan, 1979). This is a Modern Armenian translation with foreword, translations and notes, of Anania's important works, under the categories of : 1. Autobiography; 2. Mathematics; 3. Cosmology; 4. Calendar; 5. Geography; 6. Meteorology/Atmospheric Phenomena; 7. Names of Precious Stones; and 8. Weights and Measurement, in 401 bookmarked pdf pages.

G. Abgaryan, [Անանիա Շիրակացու "Ժամանակական կանոնը" կամ "Քրոնիկոնը" Anania Shirakats'u 'Zhamanakakan kanone" ' kam 'K'ronikone" ' ' \[Anania Shirakats'i's Chronological Canon or Chronikon\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 15 (1986), pp. 21-43, in 23 pdf pages.

Ղեւոնդ/Ghewond

Nerses Akinean, [Ղեւոնդ երեց պատմագիր Ghewond ere'ts' patmagir](#) [*The Historian Ghewond the Priest*], in 40 pdf pages. This important article appeared in the journal *Hande's Amso'reay* 43(1929), columns 330-348, 458-472, 593-619, and 705-718.

Nicholas Adontz, [Ղեւոնդ և խորենացի Ghewond ev Xorenats'i](#) [*Ghewond and Xorenats'i*], in 34 pdf pages. The article, which is a response to Father Nerses Akinean's deliberately provocative theory (that Ghewond and Xorenats'i are the same author), originally was published in the periodical *Hayrenik'*

11(1933). Reprinted on pp. 323-351 of *Works of Nicholas Adontz in Five Volumes* [in Armenian], Volume 2 (Erevan, 2006), P. H. Hovhannisyan, editor.

Manuk Abeghyan, **ՂԵՆՈՆԻ ԳԽԵՈՆԸ**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn* [History of Ancient Armenian Literature], vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 450-456](#), in 7 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **ՂԵՆՈՆԻ ԳԽԵՈՆԸ**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn* [History of Ancient Armenian Literature] (Venice, 1897), [pp. 497-499](#), in 3 pdf pages.

Arthur Jeffery, [Ghevond's Text of the Correspondence between 'Umar II and Leo III](#), in 65 pdf pages. From the *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (Oct., 1944), pp. 269-332. Translation and study of chapters 13-14 in Ghewond's *History*.

Խորենացի/Xorenats'i

Auguste Carrière:

[Moïse de Khoren et les généalogies patriarcales](#) (Paris, 1891), in 58 pdf pages.

[Nouvelles sources de Moïse de Khoren: Études critiques](#) (Paris, 1893).

Նորագոյն աղբերք Մովսիսի Խորենացւոյ Noragoyñ aghberk' Movsisi Xorenats'woy [Newest Sources for Movse's Xorenats'i] in two volumes: [volume 1](#) (Venice, 1893), in 127 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 8. [volume 2](#) (Venice, 1894), in 69 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 14. Additional information and appendices.

[Արգարու գրոյցը Մովսէս Խորենացւոյ պատմութեան մէջ](#) Abgaru zroyts'e" Movse's Xorenats'woy patmut'ean me'j. [The Abgar Story in Movse's Xorenats'i's History] (Vienna, 1897), in 137 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 22.

[Les huit sanctuaires de l'Arménie payenne: d'après Agathange et Moïse de Khoren: Étude critique](#) (Paris, 1899), in 37 pdf pages.

Also available at Internet Archive are translations of the above:

[Հեթանոս հայաստանի ութ մեհեաններն](#) Het'anos hayastani ut' meheannern [The Eight Sanctuaries of Pagan Armenia] (Vienna, 1899), in 61 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 35.

[The Eight Sanctuaries of Pagan Armenia](#) (2009), in English.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Խորենացի Xorenats'i**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn* [History of Ancient Armenian Literature] (Venice, 1897), [pp. 350-387](#), in 38 pdf pages.

Grigor Xalat'ean/Xalat'eants':

[Մովսէս Խորենացու նորագոյն աղբիւրների մասին](#) Movse's Xorenats'u noragoyñ aghbiwrneri masin [On the Newest Sources for Movse's Xorenats'i] (Venice, 1898), in 65 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 27.

[Հայ Արշակունիք ըստ Մովսէս Խորենացւոյ](#) Hay Arshakunik' e"st Movse's Xorenats'woy [The Armenian Arsacids according to Movse's Xorenats'i] (Venice, 1904), in 303 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 51.

Barsegh Sargisean:

[Տեսութիւն Սեղբեստրոսի պատմութեան եւ Մ. Խորենացւոյ աղբերաց](#) Tesut'iwn Seghbestrosi patmut'ean ew M. Xorenats'woy aghberats' [A Survey of the Sources

[of Sylvester's History and M. Xorenats'i](#)] (Venice, 1898), in 145 pdf pages.

[Աբրահամ Մամիկոնեից եպիսկոպոսն եւ իւր առ Վաչագան գրած թուղթն](#)
[Abraham Mamikone'its' episkoposn ew iwr ar' Vach'agan grats t'ught'n](#) [[Abraham, Bishop of the Mamikonean, and His Letter to Vach'agan](#)] (Venice, 1899), in 60 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan:

[Հայ ժողովրդական առասպելները Մ. Խորենացու Հայոց պատմութեան մէջ](#)
[Hay zhoghovrdakan ar'aspelnere" M. Xorenats'u Hayots' patmut'ean me'j](#) [[Armenian Folk Myths in Movses Xorenats'i's History of the Armenians](#)] (Vagharshapat, 1899), in 609 pdf pages.

Սովսէս Խորենացի **Movse's Xorenats'i**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*], vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 258-305](#), in 49 pdf pages.

Nerses Akinean:

[Moses Khorenatzi. Die Abfassungszeit der ‚Geschichte Armeniens‘ und die Persönlichkeit des Geschichtsschreibers in neuem Lichte betrachtet](#), from *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Vol. 37 (1930), pp. 204-217, in 15 pdf pages.

[Բիւրասպի Աժդահակ եւ համայնավարն Մազդակ հայ աւանդավէպի մէջ](#)
[ruտ Սովսէս Խորենատւ'ւոյ Biwrasi Azhdahak ew hamaynavarn Mazdak hay](#)
[awandave'pi me'j e"st Movse's Xorenatw'woy](#) [[Biwrasi Azhdahak and the Communist Mazdak in the Armenian Epic according to Movse's Xorenats'i](#)]. This article appeared in the journal *Hande's Amso'reay* 50(1936), columns 1-21, in 12 pdf pages.

Nicholas Adontz:

[Գր. Խալաթյանց, Հայ Արշակունիները Սովսէս Խորենացու Հայոց Պատմության մէջ](#)
[Gr. Xalat'yants', Hay Arshakuninere" Movses Xorenats'u Hayots' Patmut'yan mej](#) ([Moskva, 1903](#)) [Review and critique of Gr. Xalat'yants', *The Armenian Arsacids in Movses Xorenats'i's "History of the Armenians"* (Moscow, 1903)], in 25 pdf pages. Armenian translation of the Russian-language original (1904) by V. A. Diloyan. Extracted from *Works of Nicholas Adontz in Five Volumes* [in Armenian], Volume 2 (Erevan, 2006), pp. 294-312, P. H. Hovhannisyan, editor.

[Սովսէս Խորենացու Հայոց պատմության թվականի մասին](#)
[Movses Xorenats'vo Hayots' patmut'yan t'vakani masin](#) [[On the Date of Movse's Xorenats'i's History of the Armenians](#)], in 8 pdf pages. The article originally was published in French in the journal *Byzantion* XI(1936). Extracted from *Works of Nicholas Adontz in Five Volumes* [in Armenian], Volume 2 (Erevan, 2006), pp. 313-315, P. H. Hovhannisyan, editor.

Victor Langlois, [Etude sur les sources de l'Histoire d'Arménie de Moïse de Khoren](#) (Paris, 1861), in 82 pdf pages. This monograph apparently was first printed in the journal *Mémoires de l'Académie impériale des sciences de Saint-Pétersbourg*. The Google scan contains no edition information.

F. Macler and P. Macler, [Moïse de Khoren et les travaux d'Auguste Carrière](#), from *Revue Archéologique*, Troisième Série, T. 41 (JUILLET-DÉCEMBRE 1902), pp. 293-302, in 11 pdf pages.

G. Tirats'yan, [Սովսէս Խորենացու «Հայոց Պատմության» և Ստրաբոնի «Աշխարհագրության» մի քանի տվյալներ Հայաստանի և մ. թ. III-II դարերի պատմության մասին](#)
[Movses Xorenats'u Hayots' Patmut'yan ev Straboni Ashxarhagrut'yan mi k'ani t'vyalner Hayastani n.m.t'. III-II dareri patmut'yan masin](#) [[A Few Datum about Armenia's History in the 3rd-2nd Centuries B.C.E. from Movses Xorenats'i's History of the Armenians and Strabo's Geography](#)], from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 6 (1962), pp. 7-24, in 18 pdf pages.

L. Shahinyan, [Ո՞րն է խորենացու «Հայոց պատմության» ժամանակագրական համակարգը](#) O'm e' Xorenats'u "Hayots' patmut'yan" zhamanakagrakan hamakarge" [[What is the Chronological System in Xorenats'i's History of the Armenians?](#)], from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 8 (1967), pp. 21-56, in 40 pdf pages.

A. T'op'ch'yan, [Արդյոք Մովսես խորենացին հին դարերի միայն քննադատված պատմիչն է](#) Ardyok' Movses Xorenats'in hin dareri mia'k k'nnadatvats patmich'n e' [[Is Movses Xorenats'i the Sole Historian of Ancient Times to Be Criticized?](#)], from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 18 (2008), pp. 59-65, in 7 pdf pages.

William Whiston, [Appendix X. Armenian Records](#), from *A Collection of Authentick Records Belonging to the Old and New Testament*, translated into English by William Whiston, Volume 2 (London, 1728), pp. 1083-1124, in 44 indexed pdf pages. The material is from MX. II.29-30. The polymath Whiston, who translated Xorenats'i into Latin and Josephus into English, was a professor of mathematics as well as an orientalist. He produces some unusual computations to support the authenticity of the documents.

[Selected Writings of G. X. Sargsyan.](#)

*

For more than one hundred years scholars have been debating when the enigmatic Armenian historian called Movses (Moses) of Xoren lived and wrote. Many scholars both East and West have suggested the 8th century. This is the view developed in "On the Date of Pseudo-Moses of Chorene" by Cyril Toumanoff (1913-1997) which appeared in the journal *Hande's Amso'reay* (Vienna, 1961), columns 467-476.

The case for the traditional 5th century date is presented in "The Date of Moses of Khoren" by F. C. Conybeare (1856-1924) from the journal *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 10 (1901), pp. 489-504.

The two positions are *not* irreconcilable. It is possible that the core of this *History* is 5th century, and that in the following centuries it was edited more than once. This would account for the work's peculiar anti-Mamikonean bias, a bias belonging to the 8th century and later, rather than to the 5th century. It would also explain the appearance of post-5th century versions of citations found in the *History*, as an 8th century editor might have replaced older Armenian translations of such passages with more current ones.

Both articles are available in one download here: [The Movses Xorenats'i Controversy](#).

Զենոբ/Zenob

Grigor Xalat'ean, [Զենոբ Գլակ համեմատական ուսումնասիրություն](#) Zenob Glak hamematakan usumnasirut'iwn [[Comparative Study of Zenob Glak](#)] (Vienna, 1893), in 111 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 12.

Mihran Yovhannesean, [Զենոբ Գլակ հանդես արդիական քննադատություն](#) Zenob Glak hante'p ardiakan k'nnadatut'ean [[Zenob Glak in the Light of Modern Criticism](#)] (Constantinople, 1912), in 263 pdf pages. A substantial study of the text, its themes, and the history of the district of Taron.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Զենոբ Zenob**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*] (Venice, 1897), [pp. 234-238](#), in 5 pdf pages.

Խոսրովիկ/Xosrovik

Garegin Hovsepyan, [Խոսրովիկ Թարգմանիչ Xosrovik T'argmanich'](#) [[The Translator Xosrovik](#)] 8th Century (Vagharshapat, 1899), in 675 pdf pages.

Մովսես Դասխուրանցի/Կաղանկատուացի Movse's Dasxurants'i/Kaghankatuats'i

Varag Arakelyan, **Առաջաբան Ar'ajaban [Foreword]**, to Arakelyan's critical edition, *Movse's Kaghankatuats'i Patmut'iwn Aghuanits' ashxarhi* (Erevan, 1983), [in 47 pdf pages](#).

Hagop Manandyan, [Beiträge zur albanischen Geschichte](#) (Leipzig, 1897), in 61 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Մովսես Կաղանկատուացի Movses Kaghankatvats'i**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 442-454](#), in 13 pdf pages.

Hrachya Acharyan, [Մովսես Կաղանկատուացի Movses Kaghankatvats'i](#), *K'nnut'yun anor grut'yan zhamanaki vra [Study of the Time of His Writing]*, in 13 pdf pages. This article first appeared in the journal *Bazmavep* 55(1897), pp. 370-374. It was reprinted in a collection of Acharyan's articles entitled *Banasirakan usumnasirut'yunner [Philological Studies]* (Erevan, 1976), pp. 9-18.

Nicholas Adontz, [Քննություն Մովսես Կաղանկատուացու K'nnut'yun Movses Kaghankatvats'u \[Study of Movse's Kaghankatvats'i\]](#), in 131 pdf pages. The article originally was published in part in the journal *Anahit* (Paris, 1939). This Armenian translation, appears on pp. 360-483 of *Works of Nicholas Adontz in Five Volumes* [in Armenian], Volume 2 (Erevan, 2006), P. H. Hovhannisyan, translator and editor. It includes parts of the article unpublished in France due to WWII.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Մովսես Կաղանկատուացի Movse's Kaghankatuats'i**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 482-483](#), in 2 pdf pages.

Nerses Akinean, [Մովսես Դասխուրանցի \(կոչուած Կաղանկատուացի\) եւ իր Պատմութիւն աղուանից Mo'vse's Dasxurants'i \(koch'uats Kaghankatuats'i\) ew ir Patmut'iwn aghuanits' \[Movses Dasxurants'i \(called Kaghankatuats'i\) and His History of the Aghuans\]](#) (Vienna, 1970), in 390 pdf pages. This material previously was serialized in the journal *Hande's Amso'reay* during 1953-1959. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 211.

C. J. F. Dowsett, [A Neglected Passage in the "History of the Caucasian Albanians,"](#) in 14 pdf pages. From *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, University of London, Vol. 19, No. 3 (1957), pp. 456-468. In this article Dowsett translates and comments on chapters 20-21 in Book Three of Movse's Dasxurants'i's *History of the Aghuans*. The commentary includes: The antecedents of Sahl i Smbatean; The Baghakanats'ik'; The 'dragon-fish.'

Dowsett's *Introduction* to his English translation *The History of the Caucasian Albanians by Movse's Dasxuranc'i* (London, 1961), pp. xi-xx, also is available: [Dowsett's Introduction](#).

Թովմա Արծրունի/T'ovma Artsruni

M. Darbinyan-Melik'yan, [Թովմայի «Պատմութիւն տանն Արծրունեաց»-ի աղբյուրները և Արծրունի իշխանների ծագումնաբանության առասպելը T'ovmayi "Patmut'iwn tann Artsrunians"-i aghbyurnere" ev Artsruni ishxanneri tsagumnabanut'yan ar'aspele" \[Sources for T'ovma's History of the House of the Artsrunik' and the Legend of the Origin of the Artsrunid Princes\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 17 (2006), pp. 15-51, in 38 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Թովմա Արծրունի T'ovma Artsruni**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 470-474](#), in 5 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Թովմա Արծրունի T'ovma Artsruni**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 518-530](#), in 13 pdf pages.

The Anonymous Story-Teller

Robert W. Thomson, [The Anonymous Story-Teller \(Also Known as "Pseudo-Šapuh\)](#), from *Revue des études arméniennes* 21(1988-1989), pp. 171-232, in 63 pdf pages. Translation and scholarly notes of a manuscript (probably dating from the 12th-14th centuries) which contains episodes describing 7th-10th century events.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Անանուն պատմագիր Ananun patmagir [The Anonymous Historian]**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 475-482](#), in 8 pdf pages.

Կաթողիկոս Յովհաննես Դրասխանակերցի/Kat'oghikos Yovhanne's Drasxanakerts'i

Rev. Father Krikor Vardapet Maksoudian:

Introduction to his English translation, Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i, *History of Armenia* (Atlanta, 1987). The 1987 edition is an enhanced version of Father Maksoudian's Columbia University Ph.D. dissertation (1973). [pp. 1-58](#), in 59 searchable pdf pages.

[Հայաստանի ճարտարապետական հուշարձանների մասին տվյալները Հովհաննես Դրասխանակերցու "Պատմության" մեջ Hayastani chartarapetakan hushardzanneri masin tyalnere" Hovhannes Drasxanakertts'u "Patmut'yan" mej.](#) [Information about Armenia's Architectural Monuments in the *History of Hovhannes Drasxanakertc'i*], from *Patma-banasirakan handes [Historico-Philological Journal]*, 3(1986), pp. 91-98, in 8 pdf pages.

See also: [A Note on the Monasteries Founded during the Reign of King Abas I Bagratuni](#), in 14 pdf pages, from *Revue des études arméniennes* 22(1990-1991), pp. 203-215. The article reexamines the information of medieval sources on the establishment of certain major monasteries in Bagratid Armenia. King Abas reigned from 929 to 953.

M. H. Darbinyan-Melikyan, [Դիտողություններ Հովհաննես Դրասխանակերցու "Պատմության" վերաբերյալ Ditoghut'yunner Hovhannes Drasxanakertts'u "Patmut'ean" veraberyal \[Observations Relating to Hovhannes Drasxanakerts'i's History\]](#), from *Patma-banasirakan handes [Historico-Philological Journal]*, 3(1981), pp. 154-164, in 11 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Յովհաննես Կաթողիկոս Դրասխանակերցի Yovhanne's Kat'oghikos Drasxanakerts'i**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 456-484](#), in 29 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Յովհան Կաթողիկոս**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 511-517](#), in 7 pdf pages.

Ուխտանեստ/Uxtane's

Souren E. Kolandjian, [The Tenth Century Armenian Historian Uxtanēs: Was He Bishop of Sebastia or Edessa?](#) from *Armenian Studies in Memoriam Haig Berberian* (Lisbon, 1986), Dickran Kouymjian, editor, pp. 398-413, in 18 pdf pages.

Nerses Akinean, [Կիւրիոն Կաթողիկոս վրաց Kiwrion kat'oghikos vrats' \[Kiwrion, Kat'oghikos of the Georgians\]](#) (Vienna, 1910), in 353 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 60.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Ուխտանեստ Uxtane's**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 555-560](#), in 6 pdf pages.

Նարեկացի/Narekats'i

Gabriel Awetikean, [Նարեկ արօթից Narek agho't'its' \[Narek's Prayerbook\]](#) (Venice, 1827), in 615 pdf pages.

Robert W. Thomson, [Gregory of Narek's Commentary on the Song of Songs](#), from *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series, Vol. 34, No. 2 (October, 1983), pp. 453-496, in 45 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Նարեկացի Narekats'i**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 1 (Beirut, 1968), [pp. 540-602](#), in 63 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Նարեկացի Narekats'i**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 538-550](#), in 13 pdf pages.

Գրիգոր Մագիստրոս/Grigor Magistros

Ashot Hovhannisyan, [Սմբատ Չարեհավանցին, նրա ժամանակն ու ժամանակակիցները Smbat Zarehavants'in, nra zhamanakn u zhamanakakits'nere" \[Smbat Zarehavants'i, His Time and Contemporaries\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 3 (1956), pp. 7-30, in 24 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Գրիգոր Մագիստրոս Grigor Magistros**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 2 (Beirut, 1959), [pp. 15-32](#), in 18 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Գրիգոր Մագիստրոս Grigor Magistros**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 572-587](#), in 17 pdf pages.

B. L. Tchukasizian, [Echos de légendes épiques iraniennes dans les "lettres" de Grigor Magistros](#), from the journal *Revue des études arméniennes* 1(1964) pp. 321-329. French translation of the Russian original which appeared in *Problemy vostokovedeniya*, 1960, No. 3, pp. 150-155.

[An Enigmatic Letter of Gregory Magistros](#), by Avedis K. Sanjian and Abraham Terian, from *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 2(1985-1986), pp. 85-95.

A. Mat'evosyan, [Գրիգոր Մագիստրոսը և Անանիա Շիրակացու "Քրոնիկոնը" Grigor Magistrose" ev Anania Shirakats'u 'K'ronikone" ' \[Grigor Magistros and the "Chronikon" of Anania Shirakats'i\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 16 (1994), pp. 16-30, in 15 pdf pages.

K. Mat'evosyan, [Գրիգոր Ապիրատ Մագիստրոսը և նրա տոհմը 11-րդ դարում Grigor Apirat Magistrose" ew nra tohme" 11-rd darum \[Grigor Apirat Magistros and His Clan in the 11th Century\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 18 (2008), pp. 67-92, in 27 pdf pages.

Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի/Aristake's Lastivertts'i

Karen Yuzbashyan, **Առաջաբան Ar'ajaban [Foreword]** to Yuzbashyan's critical edition, *Patmut'iwn Aristakisi Lastivertts'woy* (Erevan, 1963), [pp. 5-17](#) in 13 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի Aristake's Lastivertts'i**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 592-595](#), in 4 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի Aristake's Lastivertts'i**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 2 (Beirut, 1959), [pp. 32-43](#), in 12 pdf pages.

Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի/Matt'e'os Ur'hayets'i

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի Matt'e'os Ur'hayets'i**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 663-671](#), in 9 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի Matt'e'os Ur'hayets'i**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 2 (Beirut, 1959), [pp. 64-72](#), in 9 pdf pages.

Hrachya Acharyan, [Մատթեոս Ուռհայեցի Matt'e'os Ur'hayets'i](#), in 9 pdf pages. This article originally was published in the journal *Hande's Amso'reay* 7-9(1953), pp. 350-354. Our scan was made from a collection of Acharyan's articles entitled *Banasirakan usumnasirut'yunner [Philological Studies]* (Erevan, 1976), pp. 19-22.

Hratch Bartikyan, [Ծանոթագրություններ Tsanot'agrut'yunner \[Footnotes\]](#), pp. 480-483, from Bartikyan's Modern Armenian translation of Ur'hayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'yun [Chronicle]* (Erevan, 1991), in 5 pdf pages. In these few pages which precede the book's notes, Bartikyan sets out the little that is known about Matt'e'os.

Christopher MacEvitt, [The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa: Apocalypse, the First Crusade, and the Armenia Diaspora](#), from *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 61 (2007), pp. 157-181.

Tara L. Andrews, [Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa, with a Discussion of Computer-Aided Methods Used to Edit the Text](#), Ph.D. dissertation, Linacre College, University of Oxford, 2009, in 332 searchable pdf pages.

Շնորհալի/Shnorhali

Levon (Ghewond) Alishan, [Շնորհալի եւ պարագայ իւր Shnorhali ew paragay iwr \[Shnorhali and His Times\]](#) (Venice, 1873). A detailed study of the life, times, and works of Saint Nerses Shnorhali ("The Gracious" or "The Graceful") (1098-1173), *kat'oghikos* of the Armenian Church (1166-1173), poet, theologian, and philologist, in 641 pdf pages.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Ներսէս Շնորհալի Nerse's Shnorhali**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 621-642](#), in 22 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Ներսէս Շնորհալի Nerse's Shnorhali**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 2 (Beirut, 1959), [pp. 72-129](#), in 58 pdf pages.

[Ներսէս Շնորհալի Nerses Shnorhali](#) (*hodvatsneri zhoghovatsu*/collection of articles) (Erevan, 1977), in 238 pdf pages. Articles about the life, times, and writings of Shnorhali, written by sixteen renowned scholars.

[St Nersēs Šnorhali en dialogue avec les Grecs: Un prophète de l'oecuménisme au XIIe siècle](#), by Boghos Levon Zekian, from *Armenian Studies in Memoriam Haig Berberian* (Lisbon, 1986), Dickran Kouymjian, editor, pp. 861-883, in 24 pdf pages.

Ներսէս Լամբրոնացի/Nerse's Lambronats'i

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Ներսէս Լամբրոնացի Nerse's Lambronats'i**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*] (Venice, 1897), [pp. 648-662](#), in 15 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Ներսէս Լամբրոնացի Nerse's Lambronats'i**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*], vol. 2 (Beirut, 1959), [pp. 130-141](#), in 13 pdf pages.

[Ներսէս Լամբրոնացի, կեանքն ու գրական վաստակները Nerse's Lambronats'i, keank'n u grakan vastaknere"](#) [[Nerses Lambronats'i, His Life and Literary Works](#)], by Nerses Akinean/Akinian (Vienna, 1956), with a genealogy of the Pahlawanids and the Het'umids of Lambron. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 179, in 494 pdf pages. Lambronats'i (1153-1198) wrote a great deal in many genres including homilies, letters, *sharakans* (hymns), verses, as well as exegeses and translations. He shines especially as a rhetorician.

Դաշանց թուղթ/Dashants' t'ught' [Letter of Concord]

[Դաշանց թղթը. քննությունն ու հերքումը Dashants' t'ght'oy k'nnutiwnn u herk'ume"](#) [[Study and Refutation of the Letter of Concord](#)], by Karapet Shahnazareants' (Paris, 1862), in 152 pdf pages.

["Դաշանց թուղթ". կազմը, ստեղծման ժամանակը, հեղինակն ու նպատակը "Dashants' t'ught'". kazme", steghtsman zhamanake", heghinakn u npatake"](#) [[The Letter of Concord. Its Composition, Time, Author and Purpose of Creation](#)], by Hratch Bartikyan, from *Patma-banasirakan handes* [*Historico-Philological Journal*] 2(2004), pp. 65-116, in 52 pdf pages.

[Փոքր Սկրաւտի հեղինակը P'ok'r Sokrati heghinake"](#) [[The Author of the Shorter Socrates \(Scholasticus\)](#)], by Nicholas Adontz, in 12 pdf pages. Originally published in the journal *Sion* in 1936, and reprinted on pp. 352-359 of *Works of Nicholas Adontz in Five Volumes* [in Armenian], Volume 2 (Erevan, 2006), P. H. Hovhannisyan, editor.

[«Սեղբեստրոսի Վարք»-ը և «Դաշանց Թուղթ» "Seghbestrosi Vark'"'-e" ev "Dashants' T'ught'"](#) [[The Life of Sylvester and the Letter of Concord](#)], by M. E'. Shirinyan/Մ. Է. Շիրինյան, from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 17 (2006), pp. 53-77, in 26 pdf pages.

Ջուանշեփ/Juanshe'r

[Քարթլիս Ցխովրեբայի կամ Վրաց պատմության հին հայերեն թարգմանությունը K'art'lis Ts'xovrebayi kam Vrats' patmut'yan hin hayeren t'argmanut'yune" \[The Old Armenian Translation of K'art'lis Ts'xovreba or the History of Georgia\]](#), by I. Abuladze, from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 1 (1941), pp. 31-40, in 12 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Պատմագրություն և ժամանակագրություն Patmagrut'iwn ew Zhamanakagrut'iwn [Histories and Chronologies]**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 2 (Beirut, 1959), [pp. 188-214](#), in 28 pdf pages. Includes Vanakan, Kirakos, Vardan Arewelts'i, Aknerts'i, Ayrivanets'i, Smbat Sparapet, and Step'annos Orbelean.

Վանական Վարդապետ/Vanakan Vardapet

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Վանական Վարդապետ Vanakan Vardapet**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 730-736](#), in 7 pdf pages.

[Յովհաննես Վանական և իւր դպրոցը Yovhanne's Vanakan ew iwr dprots'e" \[Yovhanne's Vanakan and His School\]](#), by H. Oskean (Venice, 1922), in 134 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 93.

Սմբատ Սպարապետ/Smbat Sparapet

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Սմբատ Պատմիչ Smbat Patmich' [Smbat the Historian]**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 769-775](#), in 7 pdf pages.

Sirarpie Der Nersessian, "The Armenian Chronicle of the Constable Smpad or of the 'Royal Historian,'" *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 13 (1959), pp. 142-168. This study includes a translation of about 15 pages of interest to Western historians. [The Armenian Chronicle of the Constable Smpad](#).

Jean Richard, [La lettre du Connétable Smbat et les rapports entre Chrétiens et Mongols au milieu de XIIIème siècle](#), in 15 pdf pages, from *Armenian Studies in Memoriam Haig Berberian* (Lisbon, 1986), Dickran Kouymjian, editor, pp. 683-696.

Վարդան Արեւելցի/Vardan Arewelts'i

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Վարդան Արեւելցի Vardan Arewelts'i**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 736-745](#), in 11 pdf pages.

Robert W. Thomson, [The Historical Compilation of Vardan Arewelc'i](#), *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 43 (1989), pp. 125-226. Scholarly study and full translation of the *History* of Vardan (c. 1200-1271), with invaluable notes, in 103 searchable pdf pages.

P'. Ant'abyan:

[Վարդան Արեւելցու «Աշխարհացոյցը» և նրա նոր հրատարակությունը Vardan Arevelts'u "Ashxarhats'oyts'e"" ev nra nor hratarakut'yune" \[Vardan Arevelts'i's Geography and Its New Publication\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 6 (1962), pp. 283-291, in 10 pdf pages.

[Վարդան Արեւելցու ներբողը՝ նվիրված հայոց գրերի գյուտին Vardan Arevelts'u nerboghe" nvirvats hayots' greri gyutin \[Vardan Arevelts'i's Elegy Dedicated to the](#)

[Discovery of Armenian Characters](#)], from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 7 (1964), pp. 365-398, in 34 pdf pages.

[Վարդան Արևելցու «Ժողանքը» Vardan Arevelts'u Zhghlank'e" \[Vardan Arevelts'i's Miscellany\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 8 (1967), pp. 157-181, in 27 pdf pages.

["Տոնապատճառ" ժողովածուն "To'napatchar" zhoghovatsun \[The To'napatchar Collection\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 10 (1971), pp. 103-127, in 26 pdf pages.

[Վարդան Արևելցու «Պատմութեան» աղբյուրները Vardan Arevelts'u "Patmut'ean" aghbyurnere" \[The Sources of Vardan Arevelts'i's History\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 14 (1984), pp. 187-194, in 28 pdf pages.

Կիրակոս Գանձակեցի/Kirakos Gandzakets'i

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Կիրակոս Գանձակեցի Kirakos Gandzakets'i**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 747-754](#), in 8 pdf pages.

K. A. Melik-Ohanjanyan, **Առաջաբան Ar'ajaban [Foreword]** to Melik-Ohanjanyan's critical edition, *Kirakos Gandzakets'i Patmut'iwn hayots'* (Erevan, 1961), [pp. v-cxxvii](#), in 123 pdf pages.

John Andrew Boyle, [Kirakos of Ganjak on the Mongols](#), from *Central Asiatic Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (September 1963), pp. 199-205, 207-214, in 16 pdf pages.

See also: [Selected Writings of John Andrew Boyle](#).

Rev. Father Zaven Vardapet Arzoumanian, [Kirakos Ganjakec'i and His History of Armenia](#), from *Medieval Armenian Culture* (Chico, CA, 1983), T. Samuelian and M. Stone, eds., pp. 262-271, in 10 pdf pages.

Ստեփաննոս Օրբելեան/Step'annos Orbelean

Naira T'amamyan:

[Գեղարվեստական խոսքի դրսևորումները Ստ. Օրբելյանի երկերում Gegharvestakan xosk'i drsevorumnere" St. O'rbelyani erkerum \[The Displays of Artistic Speech in St. Orbelyan's Works\]](#), from *Patma-banasirakan handes [Historico-Philological Journal]* 2(2007), pp. 203-215, in 13 pdf pages.

[Զրույցները Ստ. Օրբելյանի «Պատմութիւն տանն Սիսական» երկում Zruys'nere" St. O'rbelyani "Patmut'iwn tann Sisakan" erkum \[The Tales in St. Orbelyan's Work, History of the House of Sisakan\]](#), from *Patma-banasirakan handes [Historico-Philological Journal]* 2-3(2009), pp. 186-208, in 23 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Բանաստեղծութիւն Banasteghtsut'iwn [Poetry] Ստեփաննոս Օրբելեան Step'annos Orbelyan**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 2 (Beirut, 1959), [pp. 215-227](#), in 14 pdf pages.

Ֆրիկ/Frik

[Ֆրիկ Դիւան Frik Diwan \[Frik's Collection of Poetry\]](#), by Archbishop Tirayr Melik-Mushkambarian (New York, 1952), in 757 bookmarked pdf pages. Classical Armenian texts of the verses of Frik (1230-1310) accompanied by a lengthy study, lexicon, and appendices. Many of the poems describe aspects of the Mongol domination and have historical interest.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Ֆրիկ Frik**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 2 (Beirut, 1959), [pp. 244-294](#), in 51 pdf pages.

ՀԵՐՈՒՄ ՊԱՏՄԻԶ/Het'um the Historian

[Cilician Armenian Métissage and Hetoum's *La Fleur des histoires de la terre d'Orient*](#), by Glenn Burger, in 19 searchable and bookmarked pdf pages. Insightful discussion of the paradoxes in Het'um's work, the multi-culturalism of the author's environment, and his explicit and implicit aims. This article appeared as chapter 4 in the anthology *The Postcolonial Middle Ages*, edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (New York, 2000), pp. 67-83.

ԳՐԻԳՈՐ ԱԿՆԵՐՏԻ/Grigor Aknerts'i

Francis Woodman Cleaves, [The Mongolian Names and Terms in the History of the Nation of the Archers by Grigor of Akanc'](#). This important article was published in the *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* vol. 12, #3-4 (1949) pp. 400-443, then subsequently in a book together with Robert P. Blake's translation of Aknerts'i [*History of the Nation of the Archers (the Mongols) by Grigor of Akants', hitherto ascribed to Maghak'ia the Monk*, the Armenian text edited with an English translation and notes by Robert P. Blake and Richard N. Frye (Cambridge, Mass., 1954)]. It contains a thorough discussion with extensive bibliography of the Mongolian names and terms in this 13th century Cilician Armenian historical source.

Nicholas Marr, [Аркау́н, монго́льское название христиан, в связи с вопросом об армянах-халкедонитах Arkaun, mongol'skoye nazvaniye khristian, v svyazi s voprosom ob armyanakh-khalkedonitakh \[Arkaun, the Mongolian Designation for Christians in Connection with the Problem of Chalcedonian Armenians\]](#), from the journal *Vizantiiskii Vremmenik* 12(1906) pp. 1-68, in 72 pdf pages. This is a Russian-language study of the term *arkaun* "Christian" which appears in some Armenian and Georgian sources beginning in the Mongol period.

ԿՈՍՏԱՆՆԻՍ ԵՐՂՆԿԱԳԻ/Kostandin Erznkats'i

M. Poturean, [Կոստաննիս Երզնկացի ԺԴ դարու ժողովրդական բանաստեղծ եւ իւր քերթուածները Kostandin Erznkats'i ZhD daru zhoghovrdakan banasteghts ew iwr k'ert'uatnere" \[Kostandin Erznkat'si, 14th Century Folk Poet and His Verses\]](#) (Venice, 1905), in 221 pdf pages.

Manuk Abeghyan, **Կոստաննիս Երզնկացի Kostandin Erznkats'i**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 2 (Beirut, 1959), [pp. 308-348](#), in 41 pdf pages.

*

Works of Ancient and Medieval Fabulists, Texts and Studies

Manuk Abeghyan, **Առակագրութիւն Ar'akagrut'iwn [Fable Writing]**, from *Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]*, vol. 2 (Beirut, 1959), [pp. 142-187](#), in 46 pdf pages. Includes Mxit'ar Gosh, pp. 142-158; and Vardan Aygekts'i, with an analysis of the genre, pp. 158-187.

[Պատմութիւն եւ խրատք Խիկարայ իմաստնոց/Patmut'iwn ew xratk' Xikaray imastnots' \[The Story and Advice of Ahikar the Wise\]](#), A. A. Martirosyan, editor. This is the critical edition of the Classical Armenian versions of an ancient wisdom tale. Two volumes in one download, in 626 bookmarked pdf pages: volume 1 (Erevan, 1969); volume 2 (Erevan, 1972).

[The Fables of Olympanos](#), in 12 bookmarked and searchable pdf pages. This is an English translation of a collection of tales sometimes known as the Oriental Aesop. It is believed that the Classical Armenian (*grabar*) text was made in the 8th-9th centuries and derives from a lost Greek original. This English translation, made by Robert Bedrosian, comprises pages 169-187 from **Առակք Մխիթարայ Գոշի/Ar'akk' Mxit'aray Goshi [The Fables of Mxit'ar Gosh]** (Venice, 1854), where **Առակք Ողոմպիանու/Ar'akk' Oghompianu [The Fables of Olympanos]** appear as a separate section at the end. Attached to the document are: the *grabar* text; a French translation with notes by Emile Galtier (1905); and an extract from Joseph Jacobs' study of Aesop (1889).

[Physiologus](#), from the series *Spicilegium Solesmense* prepared by Jean-Baptiste Pitra (Paris, 1855). Greek, Latin, and Classical Armenian texts of a bestiary, perhaps dating from the 2nd-4th centuries. The Armenian translation was made in the 5th century. These tales of real and fantastic animals, usually with a Christian moral attached, are attributed to a variety of Fathers including Epiphanius, Basil, and St. Peter of Alexandria. The Armenian version is on pp. 374-390.

Ch. Cahier's study and French translation of the Armenian text with scholarly notes is available on pp. 106-164 of the series *Nouveaux mélanges d'archéologie d'histoire et de littérature sur le moyen âge* (Paris, 1874). Download is the entire volume: [Physiologus](#).

[Physiologus for Grownups](#), *Tales from a Medieval Bestiary with Moral Guidance Removed*, in 17 searchable and bookmarked pdf pages. English translation by Robert Bedrosian.

Сборник притч Вардана/Sborniki pritch Vardana [Ժողովածոյր առական Վարդանայ/Zhoghovatsoyk' ar'akats Vardanay/Collections of the Fables of Vardan] (Petersburg, 1899). This is the Classical Armenian text of the medieval fables of Vardan Aygekts'i (ca. 1170 - 1235), with a study and Russian translation by N. Marr. All three volumes in two files: [volume 1](#); [volumes 2 and 3](#).

[Choix fables de Vartan \[Հատընտիր առակք Վարդանայ վարդապետի/Hate"ntir ar'akk' Vardanay vardapeti\]](#) (Paris, 1825). Classical Armenian text and French translation of forty-five of Vardan's fables.

[Գիրք առասպելաբանութեանց որ ասի Աղուէսագիրք/Girk' ar'aspelabanut'eants' or asi Aghue'sagirk' \[The Book of Fables, Called the Fox Book\]](#), Oskan Erewants'i, editor (Ejmiatsin, 1668). This work opens with the *Ashxarhats'uyts'* of Anania Shirakets'i, and has a collection of Vardan's fables as the second portion.

[Առակք եւ ոտանաւորք իրատականք/Ar'akk' ew otanawork' xratakank' \[Fables and Moral Poems\]](#) (Venice, 1790). The fables of Mxit'ar Gosh, followed by other writings

[Առակք Մխիթարայ Գոշի/Ar'akk' Mxit'aray Goshi \[Fables of Mxit'ar Gosh\]](#) (Venice, 1854), includes [Առակք Ողոմպիանու/Ar'akk' Oghompianu \[Fables of Oghompianos\]](#).

[Басни средневековой Армении Basni srednevekovoi Armenii \[Fables of Medieval Armenia\]](#) (Moscow, 1956), in 173 pdf pages. Russian-language selection of tales by Gosh, Aygekts'i, and Olympianos, translated by Iosip/Hovsep Orbeli, and including a lengthy introductory essay.

Garegin Zarbhanalean, **Մխիթար Գոշ Mxit'ar Gosh**, from *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn [History of Ancient Armenian Literature]* (Venice, 1897), [pp. 686-698](#), in 13 pdf pages.

*

Armenian Writers of the 5th-13th Centuries

[Armenian Writers \(5th-13th Centuries\)](#), is an HTML application which displays lists of the major Armenian authors, heads of the Church, and corresponding secular rulers of the Armenians, in adjacent scrollable frames. Information about the writers includes their major works, and biographies. This material is based on a course entitled *History of Armenian Literature* taught by Professor Krikor H. Maksoudian at Columbia University in Autumn-Spring of 1972-1973, and compiled by his student, Robert Bedrosian, from class notes, handouts, and other sources.

*

N. O. Emin, [Izslidovaniia i stati N.O. Emina po armianskoi mifologii, arkheologii, istorii i istorii literatury \(za 1858-](#)

1884 gg.) [[Studies and Articles of N. O. Emin on Armenian Mythology, Archaeology, History, and the History of Literature during the years 1858-1884](#)] (Moscow, 1896), in 438 pdf pages. A treasure trove of Emin's Russian articles, including chapters on many of the Armenian writers and their works.

Paul Vetter, [Հայկական աշխատասիրութիւնք հայագէտ Պ. Ֆէթթերի Haykakan ashxatasirut'iwnk' hayage't P. Fe't't'e'ri \[Armenian Studies of the Armenist P. Vetter\]](#) (Vienna, 1895). This is an Armenian translation, made by Jacobus Dashian/Yakovbos Tashean, of the fascinating Armenological writings of Paul Vetter (1850-1906), one of Josef Markwart's teachers. Topics include studies of Classical Armenian authors, texts, translations, and philology. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 17, in 220 pdf pages.

Nicholas Marr, [Ամառնային ուղեւորութիւնից դէպ ի հայս Amar'nayin ugheworut'iwnits' de'p i hays \[From a Summer's Trip to Armenia\]](#) (Vienna, 1892), in 111 pdf pages. Observations on Armenian manuscripts and selections from them. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 7.

[Eight Studies](#), by Johannes Avdall, in 93 pdf pages. Avdall, a respected 19th-century historian, translator, and Armenian philologist, published these eight short but fascinating English-language articles in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, during the years 1836-1870. Included are: from *JASB*(1836): (1) Memoir of the life and writings of St. Nerses Clajensis, surnamed the Graceful, Pontiff of Armenia, pp. 129-157; (2) Memoir of a Hindu Colony in Ancient Armenia, pp. 331-339; (3) Note on the origin of the Armenian Era, and the reformation of the Haican Calendar, pp. 384-387; (4) from *JASB*(1837), Singular narrative of the Armenian king Arsaces and his contemporary Sapor, king of Persia, extracted from the Armenian Chronicles, pp. 81-87; (5) from *JASB*(1840), A short memoir of Mechitar [Mxit'ar/Mkhitar] Gosh, the Armenian Legislator, pp. 967-972; (6) from *JASB*(1841), On the Laws and Law Books of the Armenians, pp. 235-250; (7) from *JASB*(1868) Authors of Armenian Grammars, from the earliest stages of Armenian literature up to the present day, pp. 134-138; (8) from *JASB*(1870) A covenant of Ali, fourth caliph of Baghdad, granting certain immunities and privileges to the Armenian nation, pp. 60-64.

History of Armenia, by Father Michael Chamich; *from B.C. 2247 to the year of Christ 1780, or 1229 of the Armenian Era*, translated into English by Johannes Avdall (Calcutta, 1827). This endearing work is considered the first "modern" history of Armenia and the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia. It presents a highly readable account of Armenian history based mostly on Armenian sources. Chamich's work itself is worthy of study, as a reflection of Armenian national sentiments in the early 19th century. In two volumes:

[volume 1](#), in 462 pdf pages.

[volume 2](#), in 581 pdf pages.

Armenia and the Armenians, by Father James Issaverdens. Impressive English-language treatment in two volumes:

[volume 1](#) (Venice, 1874), in 422 pdf pages. Geography and History.

[volume 2](#) (Venice, 1875), in 405 pdf pages. Ecclesiastical History.

Yakovbos Tashean:

[Ակնարկ մը հայ ինագրութեան վրայ Aknark me" hay hnagrut'ean vray \[An Overview of Armenian Paleography\]](#) (Vienna, 1898), in 227 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 28.

Մատենագրական մանր ուսումնասիրութիւնք Matenagrakan manr usumnasirut'iwnk' [Minor Literary Studies] in two volumes: [volume 1](#) (Venice, 1895), in 383 pdf pages. Contents: Nemesios, Prokgh, Diadoghos, Xosrovik, Girk' Herdzuatsots', Prokgh ew Sekundos. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 16. [volume 2](#) (Venice, 1901), in 467 pdf pages. Contents: Xikar ew iwr Imastut'iwn, Agapetos ew iwr Yordorakank' ar' Yustinianos handerdz hratarakut'eamb, T'ght'akts'ut'iwn Abgaru ew K'ristosi e"st noragiwt ardzanagrut'ean Ep'esosi, ew Ge'orgay Pisideay Vets'o'reayk'. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 37.

[Հետազոտական պատմութիւն մատենագրութեան հայոց Hetazo'takan patmut'iwn matenagrut'ean hayots' \[Investigative History of Armenian Literature\]](#) (Vienna, 1970), in 172 pdf pages. A

general survey beginning with songs, fables, and tales. These articles, which were written by 1890, were serialized in the journal *Hande's Amso'reay*. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 212.

Ghewond Hovnanean:

[Հետազոտութիւնք նախնեաց ռամկօրէնի վրայ](#) *Hetazo'tut'iwnk' naxneats' r'amko're'ni vray* [*Investigations of Early Popular Language/Literature*], two volumes in one download, both Venice, 1897. Contents for volume 1, *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 23: Shnorhali, Herats'i, Ponios Anatolios, Armenian Doctors and Ancient Medicine, Smbat Sparapet, Ecclesiastical and archival material. Contents for volume 2, *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 24: Ar'akk' [Fables], Amirtovlat' Amasiats'i, Axrapatin, Asar Sebastats'i ew noragoyb bzhshkakan grut'iwnk' [Asar Sebastats'i and New Medical Literature].
[Հետազոտութիւնք նախնեաց ռամկօրէնի վրայ](#) *Hetazo'tut'iwnk' naxneats' r'amko're'ni vray*, volumes 1 and 2 together, in 583 pdf pages.

[Միջնադարեան ազգային տաղաչափութիւն ռամկախառն](#) *Mijnadarean azgayin taghach'ap'ut'iwn r'amkaxar'n* [*Medieval National Versification Written in Mixed Colloquial Language*] (Venice, 1911), in 135 pdf pages. Includes writers: Vardan Haykaz, Xach'atur (student of N. Lambr.), Kostandin Erznkats'i, Yovh. Erznkats'i, Xach'atur Kech'ar'uets'i, Mkrtich' Naghash, Yovh. T'ulkurants'i, Grigor Aght'amarts'i, Anonymous writers, popular songs. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 65. The second part of this volume contains Nerses Akinean's *Yovnat'an Naghash ew Naghash Yovnataneank' ew irents' banasteghtsakan ew nkarch'akan ashxatut'iwnk'* [*Yovnat'an Naghash and the Naghash Yovnataneans, Their Poetic and Artistic Works*].

Nerses Akinean:

An online index of the contents of Akinean's six-volume *Մատենագրական հետազոտութիւններ* *Matenagrakan hetazo'tut'iwnner* [*Literary Investigations*], is available on another page of this website. The material comprises *grabar* texts of patristic, folkloric, and historical interest, as well as Akinean's studies, many of them previously serialized in *Hande's Amso'reay*. All six volumes may be downloaded on the following page: [Akineani Matenagrakan hetazo'tut'iwnner](#).

General Reference Works

Literature

Garegin Zarbhanalean:

[Հայկական հին դարերեան պատմութիւն](#) *Haykakan hin dprut'ean patmut'iwn* [*History of Ancient Armenian Literature*] (Venice, 1897), in 1011 pdf pages. This classic study describes works of Armenian literature from the 4th through the 13th centuries.

[Մատենադարան հայկական թարգմանութեանց նախնեաց \(դար դ-ժգ\)](#) *Matenadaran haykakan t'argmanut'eants' naxneats' (dar d-zhg)* [*Catalog of Ancient Armenian Translations (4-13th centuries)*] (Venice, 1889), in 827 pdf pages. Describes works of foreign literature that were translated into Armenian through the 13th century.

[Պատմութիւն հայերէն դարերեանց](#) *Patmut'iwn hayere'n dprut'eants'* [*History of Armenian Literature*] (Vienna, 1865), in 684 pdf pages. High School textbook covering the 4-13th centuries.

[Պատմութիւն մատենագրութեան հունաց, հռոմայեցւոց եւ հայոց եկեղեցւոյ](#) *Patmut'iwn matenagrut'ean hunats', hr'ovmayets'wots' ew harts' ekeghets'woy* [*History of the Literature of the Greeks, Romans, and Fathers of the Church*] (Venice, 1856), in 918 pdf pages.

[Պատմութիւն հայկական տպագրութեան սկզբնաւորութենէն մինչ առ մեզ Patmut'iwn haykakan tpagrut'ean skzbnaworut'ene'n minch' ar' mez](#) [[History of Armenian Printing from Its Inception to Our Day](#)] (1513-1895) (Venice, 1895), in 297 pdf pages.

Anton Garagashean, [Զննական պատմութիւն հայոց K'nnakan patmut'iwn hayots'](#) [[Critical History of the Armenians](#)] (Tiflis, 1895), in 1269 pdf pages.

Step'annos Palasanean, [Պատմութիւն հայոց սկզբից մինչեւ մեր օրերը Patmut'iwn hayots' skzbits' minch'ew mer o'rere"](#) [[History of the Armenians from the Beginning to Our Own Times](#)] (Tiflis, 1902), in 632 pdf pages.

V. Papazean, [Պատմութիւն հայոց գրականութեան սկզբից մինչեւ մեր օրերը Patmut'iwn hayots' grakanut'ean skzbits' minch'ew mer o'rere"](#) [[History of Armenian Literature from the Beginning to Our Own Times](#)] (Tiflis, 1910), in 1000 pdf pages.

Hovsep Gat'rchean, [Պատմութիւն մատենագրութեան հայոց Patmut'iwn matenagrut'ean hayots'](#) [[History of Armenian Literature](#)] (Vienna, 1851), in 76 pdf pages. Covers the ancient period.

Hracheay Acharean/Adjarian, [Հայոց գրերը Hayots' grere"](#) [[The Armenian Letters](#)] (Vienna, 1928), in 507 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 69.

Nerses Akinean, [Դասական հայերէնը եւ Վիեննական Մխիթարեան դպրոցը Dasakan hayere'ne" ew Viennakan Mxit'arean dprots'e"](#) [[Classical Armenian and the Viennese Mxitarist School](#)] (Vienna, 1932), in 400 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 134.

Nerses Akinean, [Ս. Մաշտոց վարդապետ S. Mashtots' vardapet](#) [[St. Mashtots' Vardapet](#)] (Vienna, 1949), in 502 pdf pages. This is a detailed study of Mashtots' life and works, with a biography of Sahak. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 158.

A. Abrahamyan, [Լախամեսրոպյան հայկական գրականության հարցը Naxamesropyan haykakan grakanut'yan harts'e"](#) [[The Question of Pre-Mesropian Armenian Literature](#)], from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 1 (1941), pp. 41-52, in 12 pdf pages.

Artak Movsisyan, [Լախամաշտոցյան Հայաստանի գրավոր ժառանգությունը Naxamashtots'yan Hayastani gravor zhar'angut'yune"](#) [[Armenia's Literary Heritage of the Pre-Mashtots Era](#)], from *Patma-banasirakan handes* [*Historico-Philological Journal*], 2(2005), pp. 87-100, in 14 pdf pages.

E. Ter-Minasyan, [Հայոց գրերի գյուտի թվականի և այլ հարակից խնդիրների մասին Hayots' greri gyuti t'vakani ev ayl harakits' xndirneri masin](#) [[On the Date of the Discovery of Armenian Characters and Other Related Issues](#)], from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 7 (1964), pp. 25-48, in 24 pdf pages.

Abraham Terian, [The Hellenizing School: Its Time, Place, and Scope of Activities Reconsidered](#), in 16 pdf pages. From *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, Dumbarton Oaks Symposium (Washington, D.C., 1980), pp. 175-186.

Abraham Terian, [Syntactical Peculiarities in the Translations of the Hellenizing School](#), in 13 pdf pages. From *First International Conference on Armenian Linguistics: Proceedings* (Delmar, 1980), John A. C. Greppin, editor, pp. 198-207.

Abraham Terian, [Armenian Writers in Medieval Jerusalem](#), in 21 pdf pages. From *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 6(1992, 1993), pp. 11-31. The great Terian discusses Armenian literary activity in Jerusalem in the Middle Ages.

Harut'iwn T'ireak'ean, [Հայկական տաղաչափութիւն Haykakan taghach'ap'ut'iwn \[Armenian Versification\]](#) (New York, 1919), in 106 pdf pages. Historical sketch beginning with *sharakans* and including discussions of alliteration, stress, and meter.

Manuk Abeghyan, [Հայ. քնարական բանահյուսութիւն Hay k'narakan banahyusut'yun \[Armenian Lyric Folklore\]](#) (Erevan, 1967), in 398 searchable pdf pages. This is volume two of Abeghyan's collected works, which contains sections on ancient minstrel songs and folk games.

As. Mnats'akanyan, [Անտիպ էջեր միջնադարյան հայկական պոեզիայից Antip e'jer mijnadaryan haykakan poeziayits' \[Unpublished Pages from Medieval Armenian Poetry\]](#), from *Banber Matenadarani*, volume 2 (1949), pp. 183-204, in 22 pdf pages.

Nerses Akinean, [Տաղասացներ եւ տաղեր Taghasats'ner ew tagher \[Lyric Poets and Their Poems\]](#) (Vienna, 1968), in 306 pdf pages. A study of the works of early and late medieval Armenian authors and bards, including: Nerse's Shnorhali, Vardan Bardzrberdts'i (Kilikets'i), T'oros Mshet'si, Maghak'ia Derjants'i, T'ade'os Koghoniats'i (T'oxat'ets'i), Sadaghay Ostants'i, Barsegh Sewants'i, Step'anos Jughayets'i, Yakob Bughayean, Yovhanne's Sebastats'i, Manue'l Arkep. Bjnoy, and an analysis of the poem *K'ajn Liparit [Brave Liparit]*, by Yovh. T'lkurants'i. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 205.

Nerses Akinean, [Զաքարիա Եպ. Գնունեաց եւ իւր տողերը Zak'aria Ep. Gnuneats' ew iwr toghere" \[Bishop Zak'aria Gnuneats' and His Poetry\]](#) (Vienna, 1910), in 114 pdf pages. Zak'aria was a 16th-century cleric and writer. Akinean's study includes publication of ten lyric poems and twelve poems in the rhyming style called *kafa*. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 59.

Nerses Akinean, [Հինգ պանդուխտ տաղասացներ Hing panduxt taghasats'ner \[Five Exile Poets\]](#) (Vienna, 1921), in 242 pdf pages. Poets of the 16th-17th centuries. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 92.

Nerses Akinean, [Բաղէշի Դպրոցը Baghe'shi Dprots'e" 1500-1704 \[The School of Baghesh 1500-1704\]](#) (Vienna, 1952), in 414 pdf pages. A study of the churches and literature of the Bitlis area, located at the southwestern corner of Lake Van. Baghesh/Bitlis and the surrounding areas of Taron/Mush and Sasun were cradles of Armenian civilization, possessing many temples and places of pilgrimage from early times, active scriptoria with brilliant miniaturists, and a distinctive architecture. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 172.

Hamazasp Oskean, [Չորս հայ տաղասացներ եւ անոնց տաղերը Ch'ors hay taghasats'ner ew anonts' taghere" \[Four Armenian Lyric Poets and Their Verses\]](#) (Vienna, 1966), in 224 pdf pages. The verses sometimes were sung as ballads. The authors examined lived in the 17th-19th centuries: Yovhanne's Karnets'i, Grigor Arkep. O'shakants'i, Movse's *Dpir* Karnets'i, and Martiros V. Ghrimets'i. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 200.

Gagik Ozanean, [Պատմութիւն հայ. լեզուի եւ բանահիւսութեան Patmut'iwn hay lezui ew banahiwsut'ean \[History of the Armenian Language and Composition\]](#) (Marzuan, 1913), in 373 pdf pages. Contents: Armenian language, Armenian oral composition, Armenian writing, Armenian literature, Western Armenian secular literature, Eastern Armenian literature, Armenian journalism, Armenian printing, Armenology in Europe.

Barsegh Sargisean, [Երկհարիւրամեայ գրականական գործունեութիւն եւ նշանաւոր գործիչներ Վենետկոյ Մխիթարեան միաբանութեան Erkhariwrameay grakanakan gortsune'ut'iwn ew nshanawor gortsich'ner Venetkoy Mxit'arean miabanut'ean \[Two Hundred Years of Literary Activity of the Venetian Mxit'arist Order and Its Noteworthy Figures\]](#) (Venice, 1905), in 420 pdf pages.

Yovhanne's Y. Alan, [Մխիթարեանք գրականութեան հանդէպ Mxit'areank' grakanut'ean hande'p \[The Mxit'arists and Writing\]](#) (Venice, 1902), in 105 pdf pages. The Armenian Catholic Benedictine order of Mkhitarists/Mxit'arists, established on the island of San Lazzaro, Italy, has been a

major cultural source for the Armenians, since its foundation in 1717. A Wikipedia entry ([Mekhitarists](#)) describes their history and activities.

Virgil B. Strohmeier, [The Importance of Teseo Ambrogio degli Albonesi's Selected Armenian Materials for the Development of the Renaissance's Perennial Philosophy and an Armenological Philosophical Tradition](#) (Yerevan, 1998), in 176 searchable pdf pages. This is the author's fascinating Ph.D. dissertation. A Wikipedia entry [Teseo Ambrogio degli Albonesi](#), briefly describes the life and works of this important humanist and scholar of the 15th-16th centuries. See also Strohmeier's expanded version: [Ambrogio Teseo and the Dawn of European Armenology](#) (1998), in 386 searchable pdf pages.

Also available: [Di Ambrogio Teseo degli Albonesi pavese: notizie biografiche e linguistiche](#), by Pietro Terenzio (Pavia, 1860), in 101 searchable and bookmarked pdf pages.

Y. T'ade'osean, [Պատմութիւն Լազարեան տոհմի եւ Լազարեան ճեմարանի արեւելեան լեզուաց Patmut'iwn Lazarean tohmi ew Lazarean chemarani arewelean lezuats' \[History of the Lazarian Family and of the Lazarian Institute for Oriental Languages\]](#) (Vienna, 1953), in 552 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 176.

Karl Friedrich Neumann, [Versuch einer Geschichte der armenischen Literatur](#) (Leipzig, 1836), in 327 pdf pages.

Grigoris Gale'mk'earean, [Պատմութիւն հայ. լրագրութեան Patmut'iwn hay lragrut'ean \[History of Armenian Journalism\]](#), 1794-1860 (Vienna, 1893), in 253 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 9.

Manuk Abeghyan, [Հայոց հին գրականութեան պատմութիւն Hayots' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn \[History of Ancient Armenian Literature\]](#), in two volumes, reprinted numerous times: [volume 1](#) (Beirut, 1968; reprint of 1959 edition), beginning to 10th century, in 703 pdf pages. [volume 2](#) (Beirut, 1959), 11th-19th centuries, in 615 pdf pages.

Bibliography

Armenak Salmaslian, [Հայկական մատենագիտութիւն Haykakan matenagitut'iwn \[Armenian Bibliography\]](#) (Venice, 1883), in 761 pdf pages. Bibliography of Armenological works and Armenian-language literary works published from 1565 through 1883.

[Bibliographia Caucasica et Transcaucasica](#), volumes 1 and 2 (St. Petersburg, 1874-1876) compiled by M. Miansarof, in 873 pdf pages. Invaluable, extensive bibliographical information about the Caucasus and Transcaucasus. Preface and tables of contents in French and Russian. Categories include: Natural history, ethnography, peoples, expeditions, antiquities and inscriptions, numismatics, history, religion, ecclesiastical literature.

H. G. O. Dwight, [Catalogue of All Works Known to Exist in the Armenian Language, of a Date Earlier than the Seventeenth Century](#), from *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 3 (1853), pp. 242-288, in 49 pdf pages.

Petros Fe'rhat'ean, [Ցուցակ հայագիտական հրատարակութեանց յԵւրոպա Ts'uts'ak hayagitakan hratarakut'eants' yEwropa, 1896-1910 \[Catalog of Armenological Publications in Europe, 1896-1910\]](#) (Vienna, 1919), in 265 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 82.

Kerovbe Patkanean/Patkanian/Patkanov:

[Catalogue de la littérature arménienne, depuis le commencement du IV siècle jusque vers le milieu du XVII](#), in 22 pdf pages. Invaluable bibliographical listing of Classical Armenian

historical sources and their translations into European languages. This article appeared as columns 49-91 in the journal *Bulletin de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St. Pétersbourg* (1860, vol. 2).

[Bibliograficheskii ocherk armianskoi istoricheskoi literatury](#) [[Bibliographical Essay on Armenian Historical Literature](#)] (St. Petersburg, 1880), in 75 pdf pages. Bibliography of Armenological works published in Armenian, Russian, French, German, and English through 1879.

H. Gelzer, [Համառոտ Պատմութիւն Հայոց Hamar'o't Patmut'iwn Hayots'](#) [[Concise History of the Armenians](#)], translated into Armenian by G. Gale'mk'earean (Vienna, 1897), in 146 pdf pages. The book includes two appendices by Gale'mk'earean: 1. List of Books Published about the Massacres of the Armenians of 1895-1897; and 2. List of the *Kat'oghikoi* and Patriarchs of the Armenians. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 25.

Sirarpie Der Nersessian, [An Armenian Bibliology](#), from *Traditio*, Vol. 16 (1960), pp. 419-424, in 7 pdf pages. A review of Hakob S. Anasyan's *Haykakan matenagitut'yun*, Vol. I (Erevan, 1959).

Armenian Books 1525-1800 and Undated Books from the Hakob Meghapart Project Bibliography website, in 100 searchable pdf pages. Made on June 7, 2013, and current to that date. **Download** here: [Armenian Books 1525-1800](#).

Extensive additional bibliographical material is available for reading and downloading at this page of the website of the National Academy of Sciences of Armenia: [Մատենագիտություն](#).

Cultural History

Sections dealing with culture and the arts, including literature, from the first five volumes of the serial **Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն** *Hay zhoghovrdi patmut'yun [History of the Armenian People]* are available as separate pdf files, indexed and searchable. Multiple authors. Now at Internet Archive for reading online and/or downloading in various formats.

[From volume 1](#) (Erevan, 1971), earliest times through the second century A.D., in 162 pdf pages.

[From volume 2](#) (Erevan, 1984), the third-ninth centuries, in 327 pdf pages.

[From volume 3](#) (Erevan, 1976), the ninth-fourteenth centuries, in 326 pdf pages.

[From volume 4](#) (Erevan, 1972), the fourteenth-eighteenth centuries, in 256 pdf pages.

[From volume 5](#) (Erevan, 1974), the period 1801-1870, in 187 pdf pages.

*

Grabar Texts

[Classical Armenian Historical Texts \(5th-15th Centuries\) at Internet Archive.](#)

Patristics

For texts and studies of some Armenian and Greek philosophical, patristic, and theological works, see:
[Armenian Church Resources \(5th-19th Centuries\) at Internet Archive.](#)

*

Lawcodes/Jurisprudence

[Armenian Lawcodes and Legal History \(5th-15th Centuries\) at Internet Archive.](#)

*

Dictionaries/Grammars

[Armenian Dictionaries and Grammars at Internet Archive.](#)

[Other Armenian Resource Guides at Internet Archive.](#)

Indices for the Armenological journal *Hande's Amso'reay* (Vienna), for the years 1887-1961, in 56 pdf pages, may be **downloaded here**: [HA Ts'ankk' 1887-1961.](#)

Indices for *Azgagrakan Hande's [Ethnographic Review]* (Shushi and Tiflis), 1895/1896-1916, in 176 pdf pages, may be **downloaded here**: [AH Ts'ankk' 1896-1916.](#)

Indices for *Banber Matenadarani [Journal of the Matenadaran]* (Erevan), for the years 1941-2014, in 51 pdf pages, may be **downloaded here**: [BM Ts'ankk' 1941-2014.](#)

Indices for *Patma-banasirakan handes [Historico-Philological Journal]* (Erevan), for the years 1958-2015, in 824 pdf pages, may be **downloaded here**: [PBH Ts'ankk' 1958-2015.](#)

Indices for *Lraber hasarakakan gitut'yunneri [Bulletin of Social Sciences]* (Erevan), for the years 1966-2015, in 858 pdf pages, may be **downloaded here**: [Lraber Ts'ankk' 1966-2015.](#)

Volumes from the serial *Azgayin matenadaran [National Library]* (Vienna) are available for reading and downloading at this page of the website of the National Academy of Sciences of Armenia: [Ազգային մատենարան.](#)

The Armenological journal *Patma-banasirakan handes [Historico-Philological Journal]* (Erevan, Armenia) is now Open Access. All articles are freely downloadable:

[By Year](#)

[By Subject](#)

[By Author](#)

Articles from *Patma-banasirakan handes*, multiple topics, periods, and authors:

[Manuscripts. Paleography](#)

[Books. Writing. Paleography](#)

[Philology. Linguistics](#)

[Inscriptions. Epigraphy.](#)
[Bibliography.](#)

The journal *Lraber hasarakakan gitut'yunneri* [*Bulletin of Social Sciences*] (Erevan, Armenia) is now Open Access. All articles are freely downloadable:

[By Year](#)
[By Subject](#)
[By Author](#)

Indices for *Teghekagir* (Erevan, Armenia), 1943-1965, the predecessor to *Lraber*, in 641 pdf pages, may be **downloaded here:** [Teghekagir Ts'ankk' 1943-1965](#). File size: 11.1 MB.

Articles from the serial *Banber Matenadarani* [*Journal of the Matenadaran*], may be downloaded from this page of the Matenadaran's website: [Բանբեր Մատենադարանի](#).

Invaluable primary and secondary source material is available for reading and downloading at this page of the website of the National Academy of Sciences of Armenia: [Serials](#).



This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes

մեկնութիւնն այսօր մեզմէ կը սպասուի.) կ'ըսենք նախ թէ այս ազգն ի ընէ եւ դարերէ ի վեր՝ իբր թէ ան-զգայ յայսմ մասին՝ ոչ միայն օտար լեզուաց՝ այլեւ իւր բնիկ լեզուին արտաբերութեան մէջ յաճախ կը գլթէ, ի բաց առեալ մասնագէտներն եւ ուշադիր բանասէր-ները: Արդէն քանի մը դար յառաջ բաւական անորոշ եւ երկտեսակ էր նաեւ ուղղագրութիւնն. եւ դեռ ցայս-օր տառից հնչման աստիճանը կը հարկադրին ճշգրէլ՝ զանազանելով «խիտ քէ» = p, եւ «թոյլ քէ» = b. Ասկէ է՝ օրինակի համար՝ որ շատերը հակեալ են գրել Guardia փիկ guardia, եւ այլեւայլ գերդաստանաց ա-նուններ երկրորդական ձեւերով մնացած են գրութեան մէջ. զորօրինակ Victor եւ Figdor, — Bayer եւ Payer, — Burger եւ Purger, եւայլն. թէեւ երկրորդներն ուղիղ չեն: — Ազգային առանձնական յատկութիւն մի է այս՝ ինչ ինչ ցեղերու: Որո՞նք ծանօթ չէ յԱրեւելս՝ Վրաց եւ մանաւանդ Լազերու՝ իրենց սեպհական բնական տա-ռադարձութեամբ տաճկերէն խօսուածքն այսպէս. (ըստ փնդրկրեայ Հայ հնչման յարմարագրութեան.) Օ նօ Կո-րուր Կուր, Կուրուր. (այն ինչպիսի տակառ է, եղբայր:) Այս նկատմամբ Արեւմտից Վրացիքն անուանելու ենք Գերմաններն:

Արդի լեզուաբանութեան մեծաքայլ յառաջադի-մութեան արդիւնքն են մանրակրկիտ խուզարկութիւնք ամէն լեզուաց այս բնական ճամբով կրած տառադար-ձութեան. — կամ մանաւանդ նոյն բնական տառա-դարձութեան քննութեանց արդիւնքն է եղած՝ լեզուա-քննութեան այն մեծ յառաջադիմութիւնն որ այսօր ընդհանուր մարդկային լեզուաց վրայ ուղիղ եւ ճիշդ հետեւութեանց կը հասցընէ:

Այս բնական ինքնագործ տառադարձու-թեան (հնչմանց պլալութեան) պատճառը իւրն-դրուելուն առանց ինքնակամ մեկնութեանց մէջ թարթափելու շատանանք մասնագէտ իմաստնոց հետ միաձայնելով՝ թէ սոսկ լեզուաբանական երեւոյթ մըն է այն որ կը դիտենք՝ ինչպէս ու-րիշ լեզուաց՝ նոյնպէս մեր հայերէնին վրայ հին եւ միջին եւ նոր ժամանակներ: Միայն յաւե-լունք մեզի յատուկ նշանաւոր եւ կարեւոր կէտն ալ՝ թէ Չկայ լեզու մ'այնպէս որոշ կանոնաւոր կերպով երկու կարգ բաղաձայններն իրարու անվրէպ փոխանակած՝ ինչպէս արեւմտեան ը-սուած հայերէնը դարերէ ի վեր:

Ասով կը փակենք արդի Միջերկրեայ ար-տասանութեան կամ պոթմու առաջին գաւառա-կանին հնչմանց բաժինն, որ իւր ծագմանն հա-

¹ Հատոնց յառակ է, եւ թէ ներքի է ըսել՝ ընդ-հանուր գայթակղութիւն մ'եղած է գերմանական ազգին (ըստ գաւառաց աւելի կամ նուազ խիտ հնչմամբ) գղղ-pon chour եւ իտալ. pon eiorno արտաբերութիւնը: Սա-կայն գոնէ այս դէպքին մէջ նոյն արտաբերութիւնն իւր բնական մեկնութիւնն ու անմեղագրութիւնն ունի, ըստ ու-րում ի, 6, 7 թոյլ գրերուն ձայնն իրեն օտար եւ անբնա-կան ըլլալով՝ ի հարկէ անոնց խիտաբերուն կը դիմէ, որ են իրեն ընտելականները չ. չ. ց:

սու ընելու համար խոտորեցուց զմեզ դէպ ի հնագոյն դարեր, եւ դարձեալ մեկնութիւնը գտնելու համար օտար ազգաց հեռաւոր սահ-մաններն յաժեցուց:

(Հարսնակէի:)

Գ Ր Ա Վ Ա Ն

Ի ԳՐՈՒԹԱՑ Հ. ՅԱՂԱՍԵՓԱՆՍ Գ. Ի ԳՐԹՐԺԱՆՆ ՀԱՅԱՎԱՏՈՐԸ

Փ. ԲԻԼԻՉԱՆԴԱՅԵՐ

Տարօրինակ վիճակի մէջ կը գտնենք «Փ. Բիւզանդացոյ» կոչուած մատեանը¹: Աս վիճակն իրեն նախնական է. վասն զի անանկ բուն հայկական յատուկ լեզու մ'ունի՝ որ ինչ եւ իցէ փոքր կամ մեծ ընդմիջարկութիւն (in-terpolation) կը մատնուի. եւ նոյն իսկ ան դա-րուն՝ ան մատեանն այսպէս եւ ոչ պլազդ տե-սած է ամենայն ոք: Ղազար Ծ դարուն վերջերը Վահանայ Մամիկոնենի հրամանաւ վերոյիշեալ պատմագրաց շարքը, ինչպէս ինք կ'ըսէ, շարու-նակելու ձեռնարկելով՝ ի սկզբան իր նախորդաց վրայ դատաստան մը կ'ընէ: Ազատագեղեայ վրայ գովեստէն ուրիշ խօսելու բան մը չունի. որովհետեւ իրեն, մանաւանդ թէ իր ժամանա-կին բանաքննականը չէր կրնար այնչափ յառաջ անցնիլ՝ որ նաեւ անոր վրայ գոնէ քիչ մը յեր-կուանար: Սակայն Փաւստեայ գիրքը չարաչար կ'ելլէ անոր դատաստանէն. եւ ի վերջոյ սոյն ան-պատեհութեան ծագումը փնտռելով՝ կ'ըսէ ան Ղազարշապատու Կաթողիկէի վանաց երէցը. «Ի Բիւզանդիոն, յայնպիսուս քաղաքի եւ ի «մէջ այնչափ բազմութեանն ուսելոյ (ուր ինքն «Ղազար ալ անձամբ գտնուած է) վարժեալ «այրն Փաւստոս այնպիսի ինչ արգեօք անհաճոյս «լսողաց բանս կարգէր ի պատմութեան իւրում. «քաւ եւ մի լիցի: Ուստի եւ անհաւատալի ի- «մում տկարամտութեանս կարծեցեալ գործն, «ասեմ թէ գուցէ այլ ոք յանդուգն եւ անհրա- «հանգ բանիւ լրբարար ձեռնարկեալ յիւրն, «գրեաց զինչ պէտս ըստ կամի, եւ կամ զի ու- «րուք անկարեալ գիպողս՝ այլաբանեալ վնասեաց, «եւ անուամբ Փաւստոսին զիւրոյ յանդգնու- «թեանն սխալանս համարեցաւ ծածկել²:» Կան

¹ Որն որ «Հայոց պատմութիւն» կ'ըսուէր իր ժա-մանակը: Թէ իր ժամանակը եւ թէ ետքը գոնէ բաւական ատեն, այսու անուամբ Ծ դարուն կէսերը Պրոկոպիոս ինչ ինչ լսած է ան գրքէն՝ անշուշտ Յուստինիոսի արքունեաց մէջ վիտաւոյ Հայոց մէ: ² Ղ. Փարպեցի, Բառաբանքին մէջ:

անանկ ընողներ — կ'աւելցրնէ, — Յունաց մէջ, աւելի եւս՝ Ասորոց (էջ 14)։ բայց քիչ չի գտներ այնպիսի «յանգուգներուն» թիւը նաեւ Հայոց մէջ (էջ 7)։

Նոյն կամ նման է մեր համոզումն ալ աս գրքին ծագման վրայ՝ նոյն շատ անգամ հոլովելէն ետքը այլեւայլ առթի մէջ։ Ան ժամանակին Հայ մը իր սեպհական գրուածը ծանօթ յոյն ժամանակագրի մ'անուամբ կը զարգարէ, իբրեւ թէ անոր ժամանակագրութիւնն է՝ որուն հետեւած ըլլայ Հայը, ինչպէս իրօք ալ տեղ տեղ ուղիղ ժամանակագրութեան հետեւած է Յունաց կայսերաց եւ Պարսից պատերազմաց նկատմամբ՝ բաւական համարելով այսչափը իր թեթեւամտութեամբը։

Բէ աս գիրքը «Փաւստոսի» մը կ'ընծայուի, ուրիշ տեղէն չէր կրնար Ղազար առնուլ՝ բայց եթէ նոյն գրքին Գ. Դպրութեան վերջը նոյն Դպրութեան կատարուած ըլլալը ծանուցանող կարճ ծանօթութենէն, որն որ թէպէտ ըստ մեր օրինակաց ասանկ գրուած է՝ «Ժամանակագիր կանոնք Փաւստոսի Բիւզանդեայ ժամանակագրի մեծի պատմագրի, որ էր ժամանակագիր Յունաց», հարկաւ Ղազար ուղիղը կը կարդար ան ատեն, այս ինքն «Փաւստոսի Բիւզանդեայ»։ Բոլոր գրքին մէջ ուրիշ տեղ «Փաւստոսի» անուան աս գրութեան եւ ոչ մէկ մասը սեպհականութեան է գրողէն. հապա կ'ըսուի մինակ «Բիւզանդարան (այս ինքն Բիւզանդեայ վերաբերեալ, հետեւելով) պատմութիւն», կամ «Զորորդ Դպրութիւն Բիւզանդեայ», որն որ չի նշանակեր Բիւզանդացի, ինչպէս Ղազար կ'իմանայ առանց հիման (էջ 8 եւ 12), եւ ի Բիւզանդիոն կը փնտռէ գրքին հեղինակը։ Մեր գրքին կարծեալ հեղինակին անունը «Փաւստոս Բիւզանդացի» չէ. հապա Փաւստոս Բիւզաս է (սեռական՝ Փաւստոսի Բիւզանդեայ. = Βύζας, սեռ. Βύζαντος) զորն որ իբր-թարգմանիչը վերջիչեալ ծանօթութեան մէջ ամբողջ գնելով՝ ուրիշ երկու երեք տեղ իբրեւ անոր յատուկ անունը կը գործածէ. «Զորորդ Դպրութիւն Բիւզանդեայ. — հինգերորդ Դպրութիւն Բիւզանդեայ. — Բիւզանդեայ վեցերորդ խոստաբանութիւն». ի նոյն կը կարգի ստեպ ըսուած «Բիւզանդարան պատմութիւնն» ալ, այս ինքն «Պատմութիւն Բիւզանդեայ»։ Այսպէս շատերուն պէս ան ատենը կրկնանուն ժամանակագիր մըն է եղեր Փաւստոս Բիւզաս, (ինչպէս Ամիրանոս Մարկելլիսոս)։ Իսկ կրկին անուններէն, ինչպէս սովորութիւն էր հնոց, վերջինը իբրեւ բուն

անուն կ'անուանուէր։ Ասանկ կ'առնուի նաեւ աս գրութեան մէջ։

Արդ մեր Հայը՝ թէպէտ ասորին անդին ցանած ըլլայ աս հիմա մէջ տեղը չեղող Յոյն մատենագրին անունը՝ «Բիւզանդեայ կանոնք» ըսելով, չունի միտք ամէն բան անոր սեպհականութեանը ինք զինք ծածկելով. բնիկ Հայ* թէպէտ յունարէնագէտ՝ հեղինակը չ'աշխատիր Յոյնի բերանը գնելու, հապա յանուն իւր կը խօսի — առակք, առասպելք, ցուցք, ազգային եւ ընտանեկան սովորոյթք — աս՝ բուն Հայ հողէն բուսած, բոլոր Հայ երկիրը թզաւ եւ քաւ չափած, ամէն մէկ տողին մէջ իր հայրենակցաց գաղափարաց գունով սնած մարդը։ Մանաւանդ թէ իր ցեղն իսկ եւ գաւառը բացայայտ մեղի կը ծանուցանէ իր առաջին Դպրութեան մէջ Յուսկան հետ կեսարիա խաւրով նախարարաց մէջ յիշելով ի մասնաւորի Սահառունեաց իշխանը, իբրեւ իր տոհմին նախարար։

Առանց հիման փնտռուած ծերունի Փաւստոս յոյն եպիսկոպոսի մը հետ՝ զորն որ հեղինակը կը յիշէ, կ'ուզուի զինք նոյնացընել, եւ կամ յունական ոգոյ ընդդիմութիւն մը Հայոց հակառակ գտնել անոր քով. — խօսք մը՝ որն որ մանաւանդ պատմական եւ հիմնական խորհրդածութիւն կ'երեւայ։ — Եթէ այնպէս ըլլայ, ան ատեն պէտք էր՝ իբր 60 տարի անկէ ետքը երեք գիրք Հայոց պատմութեան գրող Ծերունին ալ հանել թորգոմայ ժառանգութենէն եւ օտար համարիլ։

Դարձեալ. Սահառունին խօսելու ատեն երբեք յոյն չի ձեւանար՝ շինծու գրոց յատուկ եղած ձեւացմամբ։ ԶՓաւստոս Բիւզաս չէ թէ «Հայոց» ժամանակագիր կը ցուցընէ, այլ «Յունաց պատմութիւն» գրող։ Վերնագիրներով մինակ ինք նիւթ առած ըլլալը կը յայտնէ, զանիկայ առջեւն ունենալով՝ անոր անուամբն ուղեւով իր էջերը զարգարել։ Ի դէմս Փաւստոսի խօսուած՝ բոլոր գրքին մէջ եւ ոչ բառ մը կը գտնենք։ Ստուգիլ Սահառունին է՝ որն որ կը խօսի։ Եթէ բացատրութեան մէջ կաղուծիւն մը կայ, աս եւ ասանկ թերութիւններն որ եւ իցէ դիպաց վրայ խօսելու ատենը զգալի կ'ընէ աս Սահառունին։

Վերջապէս գրքին ծայրը չէ խորշած իր

* Տր. Լաւեր 1879ին Բիւզանդայ գերմաներէն թարգմանութիւնն հրատարակած է՝ թող տալով վարդապետական մասերն։ Ասոր յառաջաբանին մէջ գերմանացի թարգմանիչն գիտական հայ կ'անուանէ։ Ծ. Ծ. ԳԼ. ԺԲ. «Եւ զմերոյ տոհմի ազգի էշխանն Սահառունեաց»։

վրայ տեղեկութիւն ալ տալու, հնոց սովորութեան համեմատ, յապագայս ձեռնամուխ եղողներուն դժուարին ընելու համար աւելցնելու կամ պակսեցնելու նոյն տեղեկութիւնը՝ մասնաւորապէս նշանակելով Զ. Դպրութեան գլխաւորութեանց մէջ՝ թէ 10 տուն է անիկայ, ոչ աւելի ոչ պակաս. ըսելով. «Ստորոտ ամենայն «պատմութեանց յաղագս իմ տեղեկութեան, «որք միանգամ զմատենաս ընթերնուք, տունք «տասն համարական թուօք:» Տասն ալ հիմա չկայ, որն որ առ հասարակ հին գրոց յիշատակարանաց ստեպ պատահած դժբախտութիւն է: Աս զանցառութիւնը շատ կանուխ եղած պիտ'որ ըլլայ. հաւանականաբար եւ ոչ Ղազար կրցած պիտ'որ ըլլայ կարգալ:

Աս բնիկ հայ պատմագիրը կ'ուզէր քրիստոնեայ Հայաստանի պատմութիւնը շարունակել իբրեւ «Յիշատակարանք յիշեցուցիչք պատմութեանց ազգացն Հայաստան աշխարհին որդւոցն Թորգոմայ:» (Խոստաբան. նախագիտ:) Ասիկայ ինք բացայայտ գրքին սկիզբը (Գլ. Ա.) կ'ըսէ. «Ի քարոզութեանն Թագեոսի առաքելոյ եւ նորուն յեղինքն եւ ի մարտիրոսութեանն մինչեւ ի «կատարումն վարդապետութեանն Գրիգորի եւ «իւրոյ հանգստեանն», (նոյնն ուրիշ խօսքերով կրկնելով) «եւ յառաքելասպանն Սանատրուկ «արքային մինչեւ յակամայ հնազանդելն հաւատոցն եւ ի նորուն հանգստեան արքայի Տրդատ «տայ զանցեալ իրացն... այն ամենայն ի ձեռն «այլոցն գրեցան:... Այս ինչ որ ինչ յետ այս «սորիկ, աստ պատմի աստէն առ սմին:» Այս ինքն «Ի թագաւորութեանն Խոսրովու որդւոյ «Տրդատայ մինչեւ միւս վերջին ժամանակն վատ «թարելոյ թագաւորացն Հայոց:» (ուրիշ խօսքերով կրկնելով) «եւ ի քահանայապետութեանն Վրթանայ Որդւոյն Գրիգորի առաջնոյ «քահանայապետի մինչեւ ցայնոսիկ ի վերջինսն «որք կացին գլխաւորք եպիսկոպոսք Հայոց:» Եւ իբրեւ ան երկու յիշեալ գրոց — Քարոզութեան Թագեոսի եւ Վարդապետութեան Գրիգորի — շարունակութիւն՝ իր չորս գրքերը կը սկսի իբրեւ Գ. Գ. Ե. եւ Զ. երրորդ համբել: Անոր համար ալ «Երրորդ Դպրութիւն» վերնագրոյն անմիջապէս կը յաւելու «Ի սկիզբն» բառը, որպէս զի մատենանը ձեռքն առնողը պակասաւոր չգտնէ կամ չշփոթի:

Ուստի գիտենք ինչ կ'ուզէ գրել մեր Սահառունին: Սակայն ինչպէս կը գրէ: Ստուգիւ շատ տարօրէն, եթէ ամէն բան մէկտեղ առնուք: Սակայն այս ամէն բանին վրայ տարածուելու՝ մեր

առաջիկայ նպատակին համար հարկաւորութիւն չկայ: Թէ յունական պատմագիր մը, կամ՝ ինչպէս ինք կ'ըսէ, ժամանակագիր (χρονογράφος) մը առջեւն ունի, յայտնի է քանի մը գլուխներէն՝ ուր ամբողջ ժամանակի կարգաւ անցքեր կը յիշուին Ամմիանոսի Մարկեղղինոսի համեմատ¹. սակայն իրեն յատուկ գլխաւորաբար երկու բան է, այս ինքն՝ մէյ մը աւելորդ շեղումներ, բան մը՝ ինչ կ'ուզէ ըլլայ՝ խօսիլ ուզելով. երկրորդ՝ մէկ գիտցած պատմութիւնը բերել հայկական ընել: Օրինակի աղագաւ. գիտէ սրբոյն Բարսղի պատմութեանն բաւական բան — անոր դէմ իր եպիսկոպոսին Եւսեբիոսի ունեցած մարդկային կիրքը, անոր հետեւութիւնը, Արիանոսաց կողմէնէ Կեսարիոյ արքեպիսկոպոսին նեղը մանելով՝ Բարսղի կանչուիլը եւ անոց հետ վեճաբանութիւնը, Վաղէսի հոն գալը, մեծ սովը, եւ ան միջոցին Բարսղի աղքատաց նկատմամբ ըրածները: Շատ բան ասոր վարքէն Սրբոյն Կերեսի վրայ կը ձեւէ, որն որ իր գրքին մէկ մասը կը կազմէ. Բարսղի տեղ՝ զՍուրբ Կերեսի Վաղէսի դիմաց խօսելու կը հանէ. կայսերական տղուն հիւանդութեան՝ եւ առողջութեան համար՝ Բարսղի տեղ՝ Կերեսի կ'աղօթէ կամ կը սպառնայ կայսեր: Կերեսի Սարկաւագապետին խաղայ հրաշից նկատմամբ կ'օրինակուի ինչ ինչ անապատաւոր Հարց պատմութեանց մէջէն:

Ի վերայ այս ամենայնի, թէպէտ մեծ պիտ'որ ըլլար աս մեղի շատ անծանօթ՝ Հայաստանի 4^{րդ} դարուն պատմութիւնը, եթէ ըստ օրինի գրուած ըլլար, դարձեալ աս ամէն թերութիւններով ալ՝ ոչ միայն բանասիրական կամ լեզուագիտական մասին² այլ նաեւ ի մասին աշխարհագրական եւ պատմական ծանօթութեանց բաւական մթերք մը կը մատակարարէ: Նոյն իսկ ան յիշեալ կրկին գլխաւոր թերութեան կամ — այսպէս ըսելը — վատթար ունակութեանը պարտական ենք ան Ե. գրքին ԻԸ. Գլուխը՝ որն որ այսչափ մեր առաջիկայ նպատակին կը ծառայէ՝ 5^{րդ} դարու առջի կէսին Հայաստանի մէջ կատարուած պատարագին չէ թէ մինակ ինչ բնութեան, հապա — ինչպէս ընդ հուպ կը տեսնենք — ինչ ընդհանուր ձեւաւորութիւն ունենալուն վրայ լոյս մը տալով: Ուրիշ վանական պատմութեան (patericon) մը մէջ կարդացածը՝ Հայաստան Մամբրէ միայնանոցին կը բերէ անշուշտ:

¹ Տես Տէլ. պատմութիւն. Հատ. Բ. էջ 497 — 509:

² Հ. Մկրտ. Վ. Աւգերեան. «Թարգմանութիւնն (այնպէս կ'ենթադրէ աս Հայրը.) է քաջ հայկաբան, մինչ զի Բարսղի եւ Գրիգորի տն զբանն:»

Այսու ամենայնիւ մեր Սահառունին, որն որ շատ հաւանականաբար եկեղեցական մը, քահանայ կամ եպիսկոպոս մըն է, ինչպէս ուրիշ շատ նիւթերու մէջ, մեր նպատակին հոն սքանչելապէս կը ծառայէ. եւ նոյն իսկ իրեն թեթեւութեանցը պարտական ենք որ աս միջոցին, այս ինքն Բարսղի պատարագին հայկական թարգմանութեան կատարուած ատեն՝ մեզի առատ ծանօթութիւն կու տայ, նախ՝ բոլոր գրուածոյն պզտի կտորներ անկէ զօդելով՝ Ներսիսի ի Զիրառու պատերազմին ըրած աղօթքին մէջ, ետքն ալ՝ Զուխթայ երկցու վկայելու ատեն՝ ըրած աղօթքին, եւ վերջապէս՝ Մամբրէի եղբայրանոցին մէջ սքանչելիք մը, իրաւ կամ սուտ, պատմելով, կու տայ մեզի աս թարգմանութեան վրայ համառօտած պատկեր մը, որն որ մեր հայ օրինակներուն հետ այնչափ համեմատ կ'եղէ. այնպէս որ շատ անգամ կ'ուղղէ իսկ մեր հիմակուան օրինակները:

Մեզի առ պիտի ստիպուի մը չկայ աս գրքին երկու նախընթացներուն վրայ խօսելու: Ասոնցմէ առաջինը՝ «Գարողութիւն Թադէի եւն.», չենք տարակուսիր թէ Սոփերք Ը.ի մէջ հրատարակուածն է, 12^ր դարու ձեռագրէ մը 1853ին ի լոյս ընծայուած. բայց ստուգիւ հոն գտնէ Տօնականաց կամ ճառընտրաց հասարակ եղած այլալուծիւններ՝ մանաւանդ սկիզբները՝ յաճախ ըլլալով, հնագոյն կամ լաւագոյն օրինակ մը կը սպասուի աս ասորի բնագիր ունեցող գրութեան, որն որ չէ թէ մինակ Մ. Խորենացւոյն, հապա մեր Սահառունոյն ալ, ինչպէս տեսանք, ծանօթ է: Իսկ երկրորդը (Ագաթանգեղոս), որուն յարգը այնչափ պատմական չէ, (վասն զի ըստ այսմ՝ ան բազմաթիւ վկայաբանութեանց կարգը պէտք կ'ըլլայ դասել՝ որոնց նահատակներուն գոյութիւնն ստոյգ, բայց պատմութիւնը սակաւ մասամբ կամ ըստ գոյացութեանը մինակ ստոյգ է), որչափ վարդապետական: Անոր համար կրնայինք հոն ինչ ինչ մեր նպատակին յարմար գտնել: Իրօք պատարագի Նախերգանի մը եւ անոր յաջորդող Կանոնին վրայ ձեւուած աղօթք մը կը գնէ Հայաստանի Լուսաւորչին բերանը՝ անոր չարչարանաց ատեն, ինչպէս քիչ մը յառաջ յիշեցինք: Բայց ասիկայ որոշ, մեզի ծանօթ պատարագի մը ծանուցիչ մասունք չունի, հապա մինակ հին Նախերգանի մը նիւթն եւ ընդարձակութիւնը անորոշակի:

ԳԻՏՈՂՈՒԹԻՒՆ ՄԸ

Կ. Պոլսէն Պր. Կ. Յ. Պատմաճան ուղարկած է մեզ Միխասայ Թոխաթեցոյ «Ողբ ի վերայ Օլախաց երկրի հայերուն», պատմական գործոյն, զոր մենք համար յիշեալ անցեալ տարւոյ Թ. 3 եւ 4ին մէջ հրատարակած էինք, երրորդ մէկ ձեռագրին տարբերութիւններն, զոր ստորեւ կը ղնենք: Պր. Կ. Յ. Պատմաճան իւր յիշեալ ձեռագիրն արդէն 1886ին Մասնիւնի մէջ (Թ. 3832—3837) հրատարակած է, որ եւ գրեթէ մերինն չափ ընտիր է:

ՏԱՐԱԾՐՈՒԹԻՒՆՔ ՕՐԴՆԱԿԻՆ ՊՐ. ՊԱՍՄԱՃԱՆԻ:

- Տուն 2. — «Ի տիրանաւոր կերպիւն:»
 — 13. — «Եւա ոտիւքն աւելի խորանին:»
 — 25. — «Հարսն փախան մօրն մտան:»
 — 29. — «Եւ փայտի պէս կտորեցին:»
 — 31. — «Զարս պրեցին իւր արեցին:»
 — 33. — «Զվրթ տանուտէրքն եւ զտրեցին:»
 — 40. — «Պատասխանից հայոց աղի:»
 — 42. — «Թէ չհաւ հաւատ հոռմին:»
 — 49. — «Արեւհալան Կերպոցոցն:»
 — 54. — «Եւ զհայերուն տունն ուրեցին:»
 — «Չաւաններն իւր Կառնին:»
 — 56. — «Եւ զգրեանքն պրեցին:»
 — 57. — «Այս շարս պիղծըն վաղէս:»
 — 71. — «Եւ շատ գանձով քարեալ:»
 — «Հիւրամեծար եր ալիւրն:»
 — 88. — «Եկեղեցեաց ուխտի օրն:»
 — 89. — «Տեսնենդառաջ քառանդին:»
 — 92. — «Եւ զտերունի նոր կերակին:»
 — 93. — «Երեւ երկիր շարսն անկան:»
 — «Ղարկուիւն վառեցան:»
 — 98. — «Ցասունն իւր հայոց աղի:»
 — 99. — «Եւա իւր սուրբ տունն մասնեաց:»
 — 106. — «Եւ եւ զարիւզ հայապան:»

ԻՐԱՆԱԳԻՏԱԿԱՆ

ԻՐԱՆԱԳԻՏԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՅՈՑ

Զ.

Հրեանքն իստաստանագրոց Լեմպերիկի:

(Հարանախոսիւն):

4. Ժառանգութեան իրաւունք:

Այս քննարկը, որ Հայոց Ժառանգութեան իրաւունքն նախապէս կողմնական-այրական էր, եւ Յուստինիանոս իւր իշխանութեան ատեն ամենայն կերպով կը ջանար կանանց հաւասարութիւնն հաստատել: Ասիկայ յաջողեցաւ զաւակաց մասին, եւ ասորական-հռոմէական իրաւանց § 16^ր որ ուստերաց եւ դատերաց Ժառանգելու հաւասար իրաւանց վրայ կը խօսի, անցաւ հայ իրաւանց: Լեւմպերիկի դատաստանագրոց Գլ. 116ը կը հրամայէ «Հաւասար բաժանումն — պէտք է որ ըլլայ եւ տրուի թէ ուստերաց եւ թէ դատերաց հաւասար Ժառանգութեամբ եւ յաջորդութեամբ¹»: Սակայն այս որոշմամբ ալ գործածութիւնը կրցաւ Ժառանգութեան հաւասար բաժանումը զանց առնել, ինչպէս հիմայ պիտի տեսնենք, եւ եղբարց եւ քերց կարգին մէջ Յուստինիանոսի սկզբունքն ընդհան-

¹ Հմմտ. նաեւ Լեմպերիկի իրաւագիրք էջ 9:

Ս. Մալխասյանց

Հայկական ՍՍՌ ԳԱ իսկական ամդամ

ՆԵՐՇԱՊՈՒՂ «ՌՄԲՈՍԵԱՆ» ԵՎ «ԲՈՒԶԱՆԴԱՐԱՆ» ՊԱՏՄՈՒԹԻՒՆՔ
ԲԱՌԵՐԻ ՄԵԿՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ

Ուզում եմ բացատրել վերոհիշյալ երկու բառերը, որոնք բոլորովին չեն բացատրված կամ սխալ են բացատրված:

Առաջին բառն է Ներշապուհ Ռմբոսեան: Սա պատահում է մի անգամ Եղիշեի մոտ (Ի. յեղանակ) Հայոց ժողովի նամակում, որով դիմում են Թեոդոս կայսեր, օգնական զորք խնդրելով Հազկերտի դեմ, որ ցանկանում էր բռնի կերպով զրադաշտական կրոնը մտցնել հայերի մեջ: Նամակն սկզբում է այսպես. «Յովսէփ եպիսկոպոս բաղում եպիսկոպոսակցոք իմովք և ամենայն զօրօք հայոց, Վասակ մարդպան և Ներշապուհ Ռմբոսեան, հանդերձ սպարապետաւ Վարդանաւ և ամենայն նախարարօք» և այլն: Ռմբոսեան բառը անհասկանալի է. նա ոչ անգի անուն է ե ոչ ազգատոհմի, որովհետև այդպիսի անունով մարդ ամենևին հայտնի չէ: Միենայն ժամանակ դա չէ կարող լինել ոչ անուն և ոչ ազգանուն. նա զրված է Վասակից հետո և Վարդանից առաջ, իսկ այս երկու անձը կոչված են ոչ ազգանուններով — ոչ Վասակ Սյունի, և ոչ Վարդան Մամիկոնյան, այլ ըստ պաշտոնների — մարզպան և սպարապետ: Նշանակում է, որ անծանոթ Ռմբոսեան բառն էլ որևէ պաշտոնի անուն է, այնքան բարձր պաշտոնի, որ զրված է անմիջապես մարզպանից հետո և սպարապետից առաջ: Այսպիսի պաշտոնյա կարող էր լինել միայն հայոց հազարապետը, որին հանձնվում էր տնտեսությունը ժողովրդի և մանավանդ շինականների վրա: Հազարապետի մասին Եղիշեն (Բ. յեղանակ) ասում է. «Հազարապետն աշխարհին իբրև զհայր վերականգու համարեալ էր աշխարհականացն քրիստոնէից», իսկ Փավստոս Բյուզանդ (Դ. Բ) ասում է. «Հազարապետութիւնն աշխարհատեան խնամակալութիւն, աշխարհաշէն, աշխարհատած դեհկանութիւն, շինականաշէն ազդն Գնունեաց, հազարապետն ամենայն երկրին»:

Ուրեմն Ռմբոսեան նշանակում է հազարապետ, ժողովրդի և շինականների տնտեսության խնամակալ:

Բառի ծագումը անորոշ է: Նրա մեջ նկատելի է առաջին մասը, ում, ավելի ընդարձակ ձևով՝ ուամ, որ նշանակում է երամ, ժողովուրդ, որից և այժմ գործածական ուամիկ բառը: Նույն արմատից պատահում է «ուամական նամակ» Գահնամակի մեջ: Իսկ բոսեան կամ բոսիան մնում է անծանոթ, հավանորեն պահլավական մի բառ է: Բայց ամբողջ բառի նշանակությունը ցույց է տալիս, որ դա եղել է ուամկաց խնամակալ կամ նման մի բան:

Իսկ Թե ինչևէ հայերը իրանց նամակում դանց են արել գործածել սովորական հազարապետ բառը՝ սա կարելի է բացատրել նրանով, որ հազարապետը հունարեն տառացի Թարգմանութեամբ կլինեի խալիպ, որ հունարեն նշանակում է հազար զինվորի պետ կամ պետական ամենաբարձր պաշտո-

նյա, երկրորդ անձը թաղավորից հետո (ինչպես Պարսկաստանում Միրնեբ-սին մեծ հազարապետը), և չէր տա հայոց հազարապետի նշանակությունը:

Երկրորդ բառն է Բուզաճարամ պատմութիւնք: Այս բառը պատահում է Փափստոս Բուզանդի պատմության չորս զպրությունների վերնագիրներում: Բառը, անտարակույս, ամենցված է բուզանդ բառից: Բսկ ինչ է նշանակում բուզանդը:

Ուշագրավ է, որ Ղ. Փարպեցին, որ առաջին անգամ անվանում է Փավստոսին՝ երկու անգամ նրան կոչում է Բուզաճարացի, չնայելով որ ինքը այս բառը ստուգաբանում է Բյուզանդիա անունից, Փափստոսին համարում է Բյուզանդիայում ունած և քաղաքն էլ կոչում է Բյուզանդիոս: Նշանակում է բուզանդ հիմնական ձև է եղել, և Փարպեցին հավատարմությամբ պահպանել է այն:

Գալով բառի ծագման՝ ես ենթադրում եմ, թե սա պահլավական բառ է, ծագած երկու արմատից, bhu և դանդ: Առաջին արմատը հնդկաեվրոպական արմատ է, սանսկրիտ bhu, սլավոններեն бѣ և бы, ինչպես և իրաներեն bav և bu, որ նշանակում է լինել, լինելություն, եղելություն, և այս նշանակությամբ համապատասխանում է նույն արմատից կազմված սլավոնական бѣлъ, бѣлѣна բառերին, որոնք նշանակում են ժողովրդական բանաստեղծություն, վեպ: Բառի երկրորդ արմատը՝ դանդ, զանդիկ բառն է, որ նշանակում է մեկնություն, բացատրություն: Ուրեմն ամբողջ բառը միասին, բուզանդ, պետք է նշանակե մեկնություն ժողովրդական վեպերի, մեկնիչ վեպերի, մի քիչ ընդարձակ կերպով՝ վեպերի բացատրիչ, վիպասան: Այսպիսի բացատրությունը լավ համապատասխանում է Փափստոսի պատմության, որ հյուսված է ժողովրդական զրույցների արտադրությունից:

Այս բուզանդ բառը իմ կարծիքով Փափստոս հեղինակի աշուղական կոչումն է պահլավներեն լեզվով, ինչպես մինչև այժմ էլ մեր աշուղների սովորությունն է եղել պարսկական կամ տաճկական կոչումներ ընդունել իրանց համար, ինչպես Սայաթ Նովա, Միսկին Բուրջի, Զիվանի և այլն:

Բուզանդարան բառը ռացատրվում է բուզանդ բառով. ինչպես տաղարան, երգարան նշանակում են տաղերի, երգերի ժողովածու, այնպես էլ բուզանդարան նշանակում է բուզանդի. այսինքն ժողովրդական վեպերի ժողովածու: Բուզանդարան բառի կողքին դրված պատմութիւնք բառը (հոգնակի ձևով) հայերեն թարգմանություն է Բուզանդարան բառի, որովհետև Փափստոսի գրքում պատմություն նշանակում է պատմվածք, զրույց, վեպ:

Վերահիշյալ իմ երկու ենթադրությունների ստուգման համար ես հարկ համարեցի դիմել իմ վաղեմի բարեկամ պրոֆ. Ռուբեն Աբրահամյանին, հմուտ իրանագետի, որ Թեհրանի համալսարանում դասախոսում էր պահլավներեն լեզուն, նրանից խնդրեցի իմանալ, թե իմ ենթադրությունները արդարանում են պահլավների հայտնի բառապաշարով: Նրա պատասխանամակից բերում եմ հետևյալ կտորները. «Ձեր Բուզանդ բառի (ինչպես նաև Ռմրոսեանի) բացատրությունը շատ սրամիտ է և օրիգինալ. միայն սանսկրիտ bhu և սլավոնական бы (бѣ)-ից առաջ, կարծում եմ, պետք է զետեղել նաև իրանական bav և ներկայինը bu նույն իմաստով: Բուզանդի ամբողջությունը հիշեցնող բառ չգտա... բայց կարծում եմ ձեր բացատրությունը հիշած հավելումով այնքան գոհացուցիչ է, որ այդ անհրաժեշտ չէ,

մանավանդ որ բառը կազմված է հայկական հողի վրա և ուրեմն նման բառի գոյութիւնը պարսկերենում պարտադիր չէ:

Ռմբոսեան բառի երկրորդ մասը բոսեան հավանականորեն առաջ է եկել bav արմատի bušyant ածական ձևից, «եկող», «դարձող» նշանակութեամբ, որ եթե չի լինի բան է ալիւացնում բառի առաջին մասի վրա՝ զոնե չի էլ խաթարում իմաստը: Իսկ ոմբոսեանը հիշեցնող բառ չգտա իրաներենում:

Ինչպես պրոֆ. Ռուբեն Արրահամյանի այս նամակից երեւում է՝ նա համաձայն է իմ տված մեկնութիւններին, միայն հայտնում է, որ իրաներենում չեն պատահում Ռմոսեան և Բուզանդ բառերը: Սա կամ նշանակում է թե իմ բացատրութիւնները սխալ են և կամ որ պահլավերեն աղքատ գրականութեան մեջ չեն պահպանվել այս բառերը: Ռմբոսեան բառի իմ տված մեկնութիւնը ես համարում եմ կասկածից դուրս: Նվազ ստուգութիւն քանի Բուզանդ բառի մեկնութիւնը: Բայց երկու դեպքումն էլ պահլավերենը կարող է կորցրած լինել, կամ եղած գրականութեան մեջ առիթ չունենալ գործածելու այս բառերը: Մեզ մոտ այս բառերը պատահում են հինգերորդ դարում, որ ժամանակից հարյուրավոր պահլավերեն բառեր մուծվել են հայերենի մեջ, որոնց պահլավական ձևերը չեն ավանդված պահլավերեն սակավթիվ գրականութեան մեջ, որոնց մասին տես մանրամասն և Աճառյանի «Հայոց լեզվի պատմութիւն», Ա. եր. 290—292: Այսպիսի չհիշատակված բառերի շարքից կարելի է համարել Ռմբոսեան և Բուզանդ բառերի պահլավական ձևերը:

ARMENIAN LIBRARY OF THE CALOUSTE GULBENKIAN FOUNDATION
BIBLIOTHÈQUE ARMÉNIENNE DE LA FONDATION CALOUSTE GULBENKIAN

ՆՅԱԿԱՆ ՍՍԵՆՈՐՈՐ ԳՈՐԾՈՒՄՑ ԿԻԼՈՂԵԿԵԱՆ ՆԻՍԱՐԿՈՒԹԵԱՆ

ARMENIAN STUDIES
ÉTUDES ARMÉNIENNES
IN MEMORIAM HAÏG BERBÉRIAN

DICKRAN KOUYMJIAN

Editor



CALOUSTE GULBENKIAN FOUNDATION

1986

SUR ARMÉNIEN BUZAND

ANAHIT PÉRIKHANIAN

Il y a longtemps qu'on ne croit plus aux origines grecques (= byzantines) de P'awstos Buzand, auteur de l'*Histoire d'Arménie*, de cet auteur que les savants occidentaux désignent habituellement par le nom de Faust ou Faustus de Byzance. La légende de ses origines grecques — une légende très ancienne, par ailleurs, car elle date du dernier quart du V^e siècle — a été réfutée à la fin du XIX^e siècle par S. Malxaseanc' qui fut suivi par d'autres arménistes. C'est dans les ouvrages de Malxaseanc' (1) que le lecteur trouvera un exposé détaillé de cette question; l'argumentation qui y est donnée ne sera reprise ici qu'en grandes lignes, et dans la mesure où elle touche le sujet du présent article.

D'après cette légende si longtemps entretenue, l'oeuvre qui dépeint les événements ayant eu lieu entre les années 319 et 384 aurait été écrite en grec d'abord par un contemporain des faits qui y sont décrits, et aurait été traduite en arménien au siècle suivant, la création de l'alphabet arménien par Maštoc' ayant rendu la tâche d'une traduction possible. Or, maints faits démentent cette version sans qu'il y ait un seul qui l'appuie. Pour commencer, l'auteur de ce texte — fut-ce un Grec ou un Arménien — ne vivait pas au IV^e siècle. De gros anachronismes dont son oeuvre est pleine, l'attestent. N'en donnons que quelques exemples: d'après ce texte, ce serait avec le consentement mutuel de l'empereur Valent (364-378) et du roi sassanide Narsé (293-302) que le roi Aršak II aurait accédé au trône en 345. Un autre détail: de tous les empereurs romains du IV^e siècle l'auteur ne connaît que Valent,

(1) S. Malxaseanc', *Usumnasirut' iwn P'awstos Biwzandi patmut' ean*, Vienne, 1896; voir aussi son «Introduction» à la traduction du texte de Buzand en arménien moderne (parue à Erévan en 1947), pp. 5-80, 309-310.

chose impossible pour un Arménien de quelque instruction vivant dans ce même siècle, moins encore pour un Grec; et c'est à Valent qu'il attribue certains faits ayant eu lieu en 297, sous Dioclétien. Le texte contient plusieurs citations faites de la traduction arménienne de la Bible et de trois autres textes arméniens de la première moitié du V^e siècle. Qui plus est, tout en étant, grâce à sa richesse merveilleuse en réalités historiques, une source très importante pour l'étude de l'époque, ce n'est qu'avec réserve que l'oeuvre de Buzand pourrait être définie comme ouvrage historique, car elle ne l'est certainement pas au sens propre du mot. Ce texte ne mentionne pas une seule date, et l'ordre chronologique y est généralement négligé. Chacun de ses 130 chapitres raconte une histoire à part, souvent sans lien avec le contenu du chapitre précédent. Les faits et les personnages historiques y apparaissent garnis de détails et de traits anecdotiques ou légendaires, le tout faisant effet d'un grand tableau épique.

Rien ici n'accuse un auteur de culture grecque, ni une traduction du grec. Libre de grécismes, vivante, imagée et si riche en épithètes (on en trouve même de vrais entassements comportant jusqu'à huit épithètes), la langue de cette oeuvre et son style abondant en répétitions et paraphrases font penser aux récits des rapsodes arméniens (*gusank'*, *vipasank'*). Indiquons aussi la présence de tours et de formes de la langue populaire (2), de même que la richesse notoire en vocables d'origine parthe, si affectionnés des aristocrates arméniens. Par endroits ce texte est couché en prose rythmé, et il y a eu même deux tentatives — l'une par N. Akinean, l'autre par M. Abelean — d'en présenter certains passages en lignes métriques.

Nulle part, dans le texte, l'auteur ne parle de sa personne, ni ne se nomme. Mais on lit, en tête de chacune des quatre sections de cette oeuvre, son titre original, *buzandaran patmut'iwnk'*, titre peu clair aux arménistes de nos jours. Le nom de P'awstos Biwzand/Biwzandac'i (= 'Faust, le Byzantin') sous lequel l'auteur est connu à partir des années quatre-vingt du V^e siècle — à Lazar de P'arpi notamment, lequel, par ailleurs ne croyait pas beaucoup à la version des origines grecques de cet auteur — ce nom ne figure qu'une seule fois à la fin de la première (= 'troisième') section, dans une notice ajoutée sans doute par le rédacteur, comme le contexte l'indique bien. Nous la reproduisons ici: *Katarec'aw errord darg k'san ew mi patmut'eanc'*

(2) A ce sujet voir surtout A. Ayténean, *K'nnakan k'erakanut'iwn ardi hayerēn lezui*, Vienne, 1866, pp. 58-9; S. Malxaseanc', «Introduction», pp. 52-56.

<*dprut'iwnk'*, *žamanakagir kanonk'*> *P'awsteay Biwzandey* <*žamanakagir*> *meci patmagri*, or *ēr žamanakagir Yunac'* «Ici s'achève la troisième section <les livres> comprenant vingt-et-une histoires <les canons chronologiques> de *P'awstos Biwzand*, le grand historien <chronographe>, qui était un chronographe grec» (3). Il est évident qu'aucun auteur ne parlerait en pareils termes de sa propre personne, comme S. Malxaseanc' l'a justement observé dans son étude de la question, et que le rédacteur de ce texte l'avait attribué, afin d'en rehausser le prestige, à un évêque de naissance grecque nommé Faust dont ce texte parle plusieurs fois (III, 3; V, 24; VI, 5) et qui était le collaborateur du catholicos Nersēs le Grand (IV^e siècle). Le procédé, bien que maladroit (4), n'est pas sans parallèle (cf., par exemple, le cas d'Agathange = *Agat'angelos*), et la ressemblance phonétique entre *buzandaran* et *Biwzand* 'Byzance, Byzantin' y a contribué peut-être. Ce même rédacteur ou un autre — car il y a bien eu une seconde rédaction — a fourni à chaque section une liste des titres des chapitres qui y entrent, et c'est à lui peut-être qu'il faut attribuer l'introduction de certains passages catéchistiques.

Mais que signifie *buzandaran patmut'iwnk'*? Pour le savoir, il faut expliquer le premier mot employé ici en fonction de déterminant (ou de qualificatif) du second ('récits, histoires'). Il est créé avec le formant *-a-ran* dont le sens propre est 'dépot, réceptacle'. D'origine parthe (=iran. **-a-dāna-*), ce formant devint en arménien classique un suffixe actif. Le prétendu Faust s'en servait volontiers: on lui connaît plusieurs créations de ce type, telles que *margarēaran*, *arak'elaran*. Or, d'ordinaire, ce suffixe s'ajoute à des appellatifs, jamais aux noms propres, ni aux noms marquant l'origine. Il s'ensuit donc que, dans la formation étudiée, l'élément *buzand* ne saurait être interprété comme un nom propre ou un nisbe. Le même suffixe apparaît aussi joint à des thèmes verbaux (ou plutôt à des noms tirés de ces thèmes) formant ainsi des substantifs indiquant soit le lieu où se déroule l'action énoncée dans le premier terme du composé, soit l'instrument qui réalise cette action. Mais là où le premier élément est un substantif, comme c'est bien le cas ici, *buzand* ne pouvant être un thème verbal,

(3) Les crochets angulaires renferment les mots interpolés lors d'une seconde rédaction.

(4) Il suffit d'indiquer ici un seul détail: l'auteur en parlant des évêques Faustus et Zort' (VI, 5) dit lui-même que, du temps des rois Xosrov et Aršak, ces deux hommes «étaient encore en vie» (*der ews kayin nok'a kendanik'*).

le sens acquis est celui du lieu; appliqué à un livre ou à un texte, le composé de ce type a la valeur de 'recueil, collection', cf., par exemple, *Hin/Nor Ktakaran* 'Ancien/Nouveau Testament', *Awetaran* 'Evangile'.

Ceci posé, on essaiera d'expliquer le mot *buzand* qui n'est pas attesté en dehors de cette formation. Il s'agit d'un iranisme, comme d'autres (S. Malxaseanc', R. Abrahamian) le supposait déjà, sans parvenir à le démontrer. L'original parthe de ce mot ne nous est pas parvenu, mais sa forme, **bōzand*, peut être reconstruite avec certitude. Elle nous paraît continuer une ancienne **bava(t)-zanda-* ou **bava(t)-zanta-*, composé au sens de 'qui récite des poèmes épiques' → 'rapsode'. On y a, au premier terme, un dérivé de iran. **bāv-*: *būta-* 'dire, réciter, annoncer'. D'autres représentantes de cette racine ont été signalés par H. W. Bailey (5) en khotanais *būta-* (cf. *būtā* 'il parla'), *bunakya* 'parole', *hambvekye* 'parole', en arm. *hambaw* 'rumeur, Gerede' (riche en dérivation, cf. *hambawem*, *hambawawor*, *hambawahan*, *hambawatenc'*, *barehambaw* etc.) et en géorg. *hambavi/ambavi* 'rumeur, bruit; parole; récit'. Quant au second composant, il est attesté en phl. *zand* 'chant liturgique', en sogd. *znt* (= **zand*) 'chant' et dans une série de composés dont nous parlerons plus bas. Ici appartient aussi m-pers. man. 'zynd, "zynd (= *āzend*) 'fable, récit'. Enfin, une explication convaincante a été fournie à av. *zandamča yātumatamča* (Yasna 61, 3) par Bailey (6) qui restitue av. *zanda-* 'chanteur' → 'incantateur' ce qui est décisif pour la reconstruction de la dentale originale de la finale, les formes du sogdien et du moyen-perse autorisant les deux solutions (-t/-d-).

L'analyse que nous venons d'offrir trouve son appui et sa confirmation dans un groupe de vocables iraniens présentant ce même composé et ses variations, mais à l'ordre inverse de composants (ce qui n'est pas insolite pour les composés de ce type, cf., par exemple, av. *barat. zaθra-* et *zaθrō - bara-*). Le sogdien a *zntw'čh 'mry* 'rossignol', littér. 'oiseau-ménéstrel'; du sogdien ce mot est passé au turc où il est attesté sous forme de *sanduwač* (7). Il est formé avec un dérivé de iran. **vak-*, synonyme de **bav-*. Le sogdien possédait encore un autre mot de formation identique et de même sens. C'est sogd. **zntw'β*

(5) H. W. Bailey, *BSOAS*, vol. 29 (1966), p. 53; *idem*, *Prolexis to the Book of Zambasta*, Cambridge, 1967, p. 257 sq.

(6) H. W. Bailey, *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books*, 2 ed., Oxford, 1971, p. xl.

(7) Al-Kāshgharī; E. Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, Paris, 1940 (SCE, 179), et *JA* (1948), p. 184.

reconnu par W. B. Henning (8) en pers. *zandvāf* dont le second composant, *-vāf*, reflète sogd. *-w'β*, de iran. **vap-/vab-* 'dire, parler; chanter' (av. *vaf-* 'cantare', balōči *gwāfay* 'appeler'; cf. vieux-slave *vabiti* 'appeler'). Ce sogdicisme a été relevé par Henning parmi les mots aux acceptions 'rossignol': '(mage) zoroastrien' que les farhangs persans de Šams-i Fakhri, de Baghdādī et d'Asadī citent. Si un mot comme pers. *zandxvān* (de **zanda-* 'chant', 'poème' + **xvāna-* 'récitant'), par exemple, comporte un déverbatif synonyme de celui qui figure dans **bavat-zanda-* un autre vocable, pers. *zandbāf* 'zoroastrien' (9), n'est qu'une corruption de **zandbāv*, corruption imposée, certes, par l'étymologie populaire ('qui tisse le Zend-Avesta'); il suffit de supprimer le point surmontant la lettre finale pour restaurer la forme et la graphie correctes.

Le sens de arm. *buzand* s'établissant comme 'rapsode', le titre original du livre de 'Faust' (*Buzandaran patmut'iwnk'*) devient clair: *buzandaran* ne peut signifier rien d'autre que 'collection de récits/chants épiques' → 'épopée', et le tout se traduit comme 'Histoires de l'épopée'. Or, c'est justement le cycle épique se rapportant à la guerre avec les Perses qui constitue la matière fondamentale du livre de 'Faust'.

(8) W. B. Henning, *BSOS* (1939), pp. 104-5 = *Selected Papers*, I, pp. 650-1.

(9) Šams-i Fakhri, éd. Salemann, p. 68.



"The Primary History of Armenia": An Examination of the Validity of an Immemorially Transmitted Historical Tradition

Author(s): Robert H. Hewson

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *History in Africa*, Vol. 2 (1975), pp. 91-100

Published by: [African Studies Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3171466>

Accessed: 21/01/2013 12:12

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



African Studies Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *History in Africa*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE PRIMARY HISTORY OF ARMENIA:
AN EXAMINATION OF THE VALIDITY
OF AN IMMEMORIALY TRANSMITTED
HISTORICAL TRADITION

Robert H. Hewson
Glassboro State College

I.

Few peoples of the Middle East have produced as many historical works as the Armenians: their historiography dates back at least to the fifth century A.D. While most medieval Armenian historians have concerned themselves with contemporary history and the immediate past, there have been some who have attempted to trace Armenian history from the earliest times. It is to two of these, Pseudo-Sebeos and Pseudo-Moses of Khoren, that we owe the survival of the body of historical memories now generally referred to as the *Primary History of Armenia*.¹

This *Primary History* has come to us in two redactions, a long and a short.² The shorter version is attributed to the earliest known Armenian historian, Agathangelos (fourth century A.D.?) and is presented in the opening section of a seventh-century work ascribed—probably wrongly—to a certain bishop named Sebeos.³ The longer version, much expanded and edited, is contained in Book One of the compilation of Armenian antiquities known as the *History of Armenia* by Pseudo-Moses of Khoren. While the date of this work has been much disputed, it appears now to be a product of the late eighth or early ninth century.⁴

According to Pseudo-Sebeos the short redaction of the *Primary History* was a work originally written by Agathangelos, secretary to Tiridates III (298-330), the first Christian king of Armenia, and was based on information contained in a book written by a certain Marab the Philosopher from Mtsurn, a town in western Armenia. Pseudo-Moses, on the other hand, claims that the parallel material in his history (I. 9-32 and II. 1-9) is an extract by Marabas Katiba from a Greek translation of a Chaldean history of Armenia made by order of Alexander the Great.

Neither of these claims will bear critical examination.⁵ Not only are the two works not identical, but each was clearly set down by different authors, neither of whom was familiar with the work of the other. Actually, what they represent are two independently written accounts based on parallel versions of the same broad historical tradition—a tradition handed down by one means or another over a period of several centuries.⁶ While in both cases the material supposedly ends with the coming of Alexander the Great in about 330 B.C., it also includes information on sovereigns reigning as late as the second century B.C., that is, some eight hundred years before the date of the version found in Pseudo-Sebeos. On the other hand, the earliest historical personage referred to in the text, Aramu of Urartu, lived in the ninth century B.C., that is, about 1500 years before the time of Pseudo-Sebeos. The exact sources of the various elements contained in the *Primary History* are not important here.⁷ What is of concern in the validity of a historical tradition handed down over so long a period of time before being committed to final written form.

The bulk of the material contained in the *Primary History* consists of a genealogical

sketch of the kings of ancient Armenia from the earliest times down to Alexander the Great. In the short version, set down in the seventh century A.D., this material is simple and straightforward in presentation. In the longer version, produced a century or two later, the material is not only expanded, but somewhat different, and is accompanied by a kind of historical commentary. It is to the question of the nature and validity of the basic data contained in these two versions that this paper is addressed.

The short redaction of the *Primary History* contains the genealogical data shown in Table 1, while the expanded version of the same basic material as preserved by Pseudo-Moses is shown in Table 2. In comparing the data encountered in the two lists we first note that beginning with Hayk there are no more (and perhaps fewer) than fourteen generations in the short list, whereas there are no fewer than fifty-four generations in the longer one. P'arnavaz, for example, is the fourteenth sovereign in the short list while Parnuas, obviously the same personage, is fortieth in the long. Zareh and his son Armog, however, who precede P'arnavaz in the short list and are separated from him by only two generations, succeed Parnuas in the long list by nine generations. In addition to this, two rulers appearing in the short list, Sarhank and Biwrat, are absent from the much longer list of Pseudo-Moses, while there is no mention in the former of any Armenian sovereign ruling at the time of Alexander. Telescoping also is evident in the shorter list: the rule of the Babylonians is followed directly by that of the Medes and no mention is made of the reign of the Assyrians after the Babylonians or of the Persians after the Medes.

II.

Our first step in attempting to ascertain what might be valid in these lists is to determine which, if any, of these kings can be identified from external sources. For this purpose we shall concentrate on the longer redaction of the list as all *identifiable* names are contained therein, while several such names are missing in the shorter version.

Obviously the material from Noah through Thomgarma is totally Biblical and served to link the newly Christianized Armenians to the genealogy of nations contained in Genesis. This attempt shows the influence of Hippolytus of Rome who, in his *Chronicle*, traced the Armenians from Thogarma, a version of their origin followed by most Armenian and Georgian writers.⁸ Even here, however, a grain of truth (or a remarkable coincidence) is revealed when we recall that in Genesis Thogarma represents Til-garimmu, the Assyrian name for an ancient state in east central Anatolia, probably of Phrygian origin, and further recall that Herodotus claimed that the Armenians originally were Phrygian colonists.⁹ As for the remaining names in the longer list, we may single out the following as those on which some light may be shed:

- [1] Hayk. The Armenians call themselves Hayk' (sing. Hay), and Hayk is regarded as the eponymous progenitor of their race. Originally a divine figure, under the influence of Christianity he was reduced to "one of the giants" and was made out to be a son of Thogarma.¹⁰ If, indeed, the Armenians were of Phrygian origin, and Til-garimmu, immediately to the west of later Armenia, was a Phrygian formation, then Hayk, son of Thogarma, might well have become a personification of the Armenians as offshoots of Til-garimmu. Beginning here Moses of Khoren appears to be summarizing, albeit in a highly garbled form, the history of ancient Urartu, the memory of which appears to have survived, however vaguely, in the Armenian historical tradition. His description of how the various sons and grandsons of Hayk expanded from their original homeland in Vayots Tzor and Hark', for example, is parallel to the actual conquest of the Armenian plateau by the Urartians moving out from

their center around Lake Van, on the north shore of which lay Hark' and on the south shore Vayots Tzor. Hayk's son Armenak is said to have settled in the plain of Ararat; Armenak's elder grandson, Gegham, along Lake Gegham (now Lake Sevan) further east; Gegham's second son Sisak gave his name to Sisakan (Siwnik'), the region immediately south of the lake; finally, Gegham's son Aram is described as a great conqueror who subjected the entire Armenian plateau to his rule. This account, however streamlined, is a reasonably accurate description of the growth of Urartu as we know it, but it was reduced by the Armenian historical tradition to straightforward genealogical history.

- [2] **Armenak.** Armenak may be connected in some way with Erimena, a late and to date little-known king of Urartu (ca. 625 B.C.). Again, however, Armenak may be purely eponymous in origin, for it is owing to his exploits, we are told by Pseudo-Moses, that the Hayk were called 'Armenians' by other nations.
- [3] **Armais.** He is not known to any outside source but there is a possibility that his name cloaks that of Argisti, one of the two most important Urartian monarchs, and thus that it should be read as **Argais*, an easy spelling error to make in the Armenian script. Argisti I (ca. 786-764 or ca. 780-754 B.C.) was the founder of the city of Argishtihinili, later called Armavir, and Armais is credited in the *Primary History* with being the founder and eponym of this same city. Since Argisti was the first Urartian king to reach Mt. Aragadz on the northern edge of the Ararat plain, it is not unlikely that this mountain was named after him as well. According to Pseudo-Moses Aragadz, however, was named after Armenak which could mean that Armenak/Armais/*Argais/Argisti were one and the same individual.¹¹

Moses makes Manavaz the younger son of Armenak and a brother of Armais, but he is almost certainly an historical memory of the Urartian ruler Menuas (ca. 810-ca. 786 B.C.).¹² Baz, the son of Manavaz, can be recognized in the Urartian prince Bias, a contemporary of Argisti cited in a Urartian inscription.¹³ Arast, a son of Armais, who is said by Moses to have given his name to the river Arax (Arm., *Yerashk*) is possibly the Urartian prince Erias, another contemporary of Argisti, whose territory seems to have been located in the Ararat plain, precisely along the Arax river.¹⁴

- [5] **Gegham.** He is said to have left Armenia and gone to the shore of a great lake which was thenceforward called Gegh, and to have settled people in a region called after him—Geghak'unik'. Gegham, then, was probably not a person but an eponym—a personification of the lake (now called Sevan) and district of Geghak'uni, whose names are actually derived from *Welikuh*, the name of this region even before the time of Urartu, which conquered it in the late eighth century B.C.¹⁵ Sisak, brother of [6] Harma and son of Gegham, can only be another eponym, and a late one at that. Sisak is said to have been the ancestor of the princes of Siwnik', a province on the southern border of Geghak'uni. It was called Sisakan by the Sasanids (who ruled Persia from 226 to 637 A.D.); this term was unknown to Armenian historiography before the seventh century A.D. and was first used by a Syrian writer only in the sixth century.¹⁶
- [7] **Aram.** This is certainly Aramu (mid-ninth century B.C.), the first known ruler of Urartu. This identification is based not only on the similarity of names but also on the historical information on Aram provided by Pseudo-Moses which, emphasizing the conquests of Aram and his wars with Assyria, can only refer to the exploits of Aramu. The growing belief that the successors of Aramu were not his descendants

may be the reason that the successors were not known to Pseudo-Moses, his information on Aramu perhaps having been preserved in the family to which he belonged.

- [8] **Ara.** The *Primary History* in both versions makes Ara a son of Aram, although the real Aramu was (so far as we know) succeeded directly by a king named Sarduri I (fl. 834 B.C.). Ara, however, was known to one outside source. Plato in his *Republic* referred to "Er son of Armenius" (or, perhaps, "Er the Armenian") in a context which can only be that of Ara.¹⁷ The fact that Plato—so much closer to the period in question than our Armenian texts—referred to Er's father as Armenius makes it possible to suggest that Er son of Armenius, Ara son of Aram, and perhaps the earlier Armais son of Armenak were variant images of the same person. The *Primary History*'s historical data concerning Ara are very dubious. Although he is considered to have been the contemporary of Semiramis of Assyria (i.e., Sammuamat, 812-803), this queen actually was a contemporary of the important Urartian ruler Menuas (ca. 810-781) and it is more likely that Ara, if he ever existed, has been rendered as an Armenian version of the Asianic deity Arash or Attys, whose legend his story strongly resembles.
- [21] **Shavarsh** or **Shavash**. A certain Sabaris is mentioned by Xenophon as a son of an Armenian king in the time of Cyrus the Great (559-530 B.C.). See [46] below.
- [26] **Hrant**. This is an Armenian version of the Iranian (Avestan) *aurand/aurvant*, 'mighty' or 'hero,' which was usually rendered into Greek as Orontes. The Orontids were the first independent dynasty of Armenian rulers; other members of this house appear later in the list and will be discussed below.
- [30] **Zarmayr** is said to have played a major role in the Trojan War as an ally of Priam of Troy. No such figure appears in the Greek accounts of this conflict; nor are the Armenians mentioned with it in any connection.
- [37] **Skayordi**. This is not a name at all but an epithet meaning 'son of the giant' or perhaps 'son of the Scyth.' If the latter is the case—and it is very possible—then this could only have been designated as a personal name long after the original meaning of the term *Saka*—Iranian for the Scythians—had been forgotten. It is known that the Scythians invaded the Armenia area in the seventh century B.C. and it is not impossible that in this little-known and confused period between the disappearance of Urartu and the rise of the Orontid kingdom a ruler of Armenia or part of Armenia could have been the son of a Scythian chieftain, perhaps by an Armenian princess.
- [45] **Ervant**. Cited as a contemporary of Darius III (336-330 B.C.), this is another Orontid name and must refer to Orontes II, satrap of Armenia from ca. 344 to ca. 331 B.C.
- [46] **Tigran**. Cited as a contemporary of Cyrus the Great, we are on firmer ground here, for according to Xenophon's historical romance *Cyropaedia* (early fourth century B.C.) there was an ally of Cyrus who had two sons, Tigranes and Sabaris.¹⁸ Now Sabaris is a Greek form of an Armenian rendering of the Persian name usually translated into Greek as Xerxes. Xenophon's use of a Greek form of that Armenian rendering reveals the Armenian source for his data, which further enhances its value for our purpose. It is interesting to note that a king named Shavarsh appears earlier in the list as the great-great-great-grandfather of Hrant.
- [47] **Vahagn**. Son of Tigran. This is an Armenian version of the Indo-Iranian Vtrahan or Vērēθragna, a deity identified with the Greek Hercules.¹⁹ Much is made of the exploits of Vahagn by Pseudo-Moses (I. 31; II. 12), and he specifically tells us that he had once been worshipped as a god. This is emphasized in his statement that the

hereditary high priests of Armenia were descended from him. In this memory we have a clear example of the common practice whereby a deity is transformed into an ancestor.

Bagaram-Angegh, found as a king in the short list and as a collateral member of the royal family in the longer one (where he is called Tork'-Angegheay), was another deity reduced to human stature. Angegh-Tork is a syncretism of Tarku, the Anatolian god of vegetation and the proto-Armenian god of the underworld. He is also an equivalent of the Sumerian-Akkadian god Nergal, as is demonstrated by the fact that Angegh is used in the Armenian Bible to translate Nergal wherever that name appears in the original Hebrew (e.g., IV Kings, 17:30).

The Orontid dynasty ruled Armenia from ca. 401 until ca. 200 B.C. It began with two satraps (Orontes I and II) ruling Armenia for the Persians prior to Alexander the Great. Orontes II became king after Alexander's conquest of the Persian empire. Orontes was followed by Mithranes, Orontes III, Samus, Arsames, Xerxes, [Abdissares?], and Orontes IV.²⁰ A certain Artaxias then rose against the Orontids and became master of Armenia proper, while the Orontid Zariadris retained control of the western province of Sophene, threw off the yoke of the Seleucid successors of Alexander in Syria, and established Sophene as a separate state.

Of these Orontid rulers, Orontes IV, overthrown by Artaxias, is remembered by Pseudo-Moses as Eruand overthrown by Artashes, while the same author remembers Zariadris of Sophene, who threw off the Seleucid yoke, as Zareh, who overthrew the Assyrians (read: Syrians). Hrant [26], son of Gorak; Aravan [48], son of Vahagn and grandson of Eruand, and Armog [51], son of Zareh (read: Artok, that is, Artanes, the name given by Strabo to Orontes V, the last Orontid ruler deposed in 95 B.C.) are all probably members of this same dynasty as well.²¹ Note, however, the chronological imbroglio caused by the confusion—frequent in Armenian historiography—between *Asorestan* (Assyria), and *Asorik'* (Syria). As a result the overthrow of Seleucid rule was projected back 400 years and remembered as the overthrow of Assyrian suzerainty.²² Note also that Armenian historical tradition made one continuous dynasty of the kings of Urartu (most of whom, though, remained unknown to that tradition), the Orontids, and the Artaxiads. Still later in the same tradition, but after the list found in the *Primary History*, the Arsacid dynasty is made to follow directly after the Artaxiads, although there was an interval of more than fifty years (and many rulers) between them. Furthermore, the kings of all four dynasties were regarded as belonging to a single royal line springing from Haik and ultimately from Noah.

III.

Thus of the fifty-four kings listed from Haik through Vahe, a bare sixteen can be identified—even fewer with certainty—with known historical figures, or at least linked with events in real Armenian history. On the other hand, there is no mention of any of the other rulers of Urartu (Sarduri, Ishpuina, Menuas, and Rusa) except perhaps, as we have seen, Argisti and Erimena. Nor, we might add, do the names of the chief Urartian deities, Khaldi and Teisheba, appear in the list, although at least two gods of the pagan Armenian pantheon do appear.

The attempt to provide a chronological framework for this kinglist by citing Biblical and other contemporaries for some of the monarchs is patently a fantasy and dates from the Christian period of Armenian history, that is, the fourth century or later. Moreover, the length of the list and the actual length of time separating each of the known

non-Armenian contemporaries as determined by modern historical research, are hopelessly at variance with one another. If Aram, for example, was in fact a contemporary of Abraham (ca. 2000 B.C.) his son Ara could hardly have been a contemporary of the Assyrian Queen Semiramis (812-803 B.C.). Meanwhile some thirty generations separate Ara from Paruyr, a supposed contemporary of Sardanapalus of Assyria (Ashurbanipal, 668-624 B.C.). The length of the list is itself an indication of its spurious character. Allowing thirty years for a generation (which is a good statistical average) the fifty-four generations between Haik and Alexander the Great would place the date of the former at ca. 1957 B.C.²³ The chronological indications in the list, the genealogical linking of one king to another, and the indications of contemporaneity with prominent non-Armenian figures are thus of almost no value. The question which must now be asked is where did the other thirty-eight names come from, and how was this genealogical scaffolding erected?

The answer to both questions lies in the nature of the Armenian state, which, far from being the strong centralized and unified monarchy it was often depicted as being, was in reality a federation of princely states under a relatively weak king who was regarded by the princes simply as a first among equals.²⁴ Consequently many of the monarchs in the genealogy may well represent lists of remembered rulers of separate princely states incorporated by the Armenian historical tradition into a single immemorial royal dynasty. This weaving of many different lists of rulers into one was no doubt aided by the claim of many princely houses to be descended from Hayk, but it is also clear that this synthesis could have been accomplished only relatively late in Armenian history, when many of the Armenian princely houses had died out, and after the monarchy had been extinct long enough for tradition to have endowed it with an exclusivity of sovereignty which no Armenian royal dynasty had ever possessed. Now these conditions were already present in the seventh century A.D., when the Armenian royal houses, once about fifty in number, had been reduced to fewer than thirty, and the Arsacid monarchy had been in 'abeyance' since 428.²⁵

They were much more of a reality, however, in the late eighth century, when Pseudo-Moses is believed to have compiled his work, and we may note that not only is it in his version of the *Primary History* that we find most of our details for the descent of princely houses from scions of the mythical royal house of Hayk, but it is Pseudo-Moses who, long after the extinction of the Arsacids, was the first to endow the Armenian monarchy, ex post facto as it were, with a monopoly of sovereignty it had never possessed. The list of 'kings' was then swollen by the addition of the names of such gods as Vahagn and Anghen who, under the influence of Christianity, were reduced from deities to kings and duly entered into the list. The blending of gods and mortals into one genealogical tree suggests traces of the ancient pagan concept of the descent of kings from gods, as well as the equally typical ancient idea of divine kingship. The genealogy found in the *Primary History* is thus a mythical construction woven with genuine threads of the religion and history of early Armenia. In Toumanoff's words these lists are "a blend of theogonies of the pagan past—divinities become heroes in the Christian monuments—with a pell-mell of reminiscences about the Vannic [i.e., Urartian], Scythian, proto-Armenian, and early Armenian rulers."²⁶

In sum, the kinglist found in the *Primary History* exhibits many signs of artificiality, including excessive lengthening of the past, a total lack of usurpers, dynastic changes and multiple reigns, personification of eras by folk heroes, the arranging of contemporary rulers as successive, and extended father/son succession. To these points may be added such particularities as the confusion of two identically named rulers as one, the possible

confusion of variants of the same name as more than one ruler, and, finally, the introduction of deities into the list in the guise of mere mortals, albeit of heroic dimensions.

One thing is clear from our examination of the long and short Armenian royal genealogies: as history it is too hopelessly muddled to serve by itself for a reconstruction of the history of early Armenia or for the sequence and lives of its rulers. In recognizing the dubious quality of the material in the *Primary History* we may note that the Armenians were not totally preliterate before the invention of the Armenian alphabet in the fifth century A.D. The existence of a proto-Armenian alphabet in the early Christian period is mentioned, some Greek and Latin inscriptions have been found in Armenia, and three royal inscriptions in Aramaic from the time of Artaxias (ca. 200 B.C.) have also been discovered. In addition, the Urartians used the cuneiform system of writing before the establishment of an Armenian state, while Armenia itself was surrounded by literate peoples—Greeks, Persians, Aramaeans, etc.—and had access to their records.²⁷ Yet, for all this, it is clear that their historical tradition is very faulty.

At the same time, however, it is no less clear that, despite the passage of many centuries, some valid, though distorted, recollections of some names and events did persist. Although the Armenian historical tradition, in the genealogical idiom established in the eighth century, is hopelessly defective, we can gain insights from the very nature of the distortions. While the material in the earliest portions of the *Primary History* cannot be regarded and used as factual data, our ability to compare them with what we know of the recorded history of the period and region can be analytically useful, particularly for societies for which such extraneous materials are not available.

NOTES

1. For the only serious discussion of this work in English see Cyril Toumanoff, *Studies in Christian Caucasian History* (Washington, 1963).

2. For the short redaction, translated into French under the title "Le Pseudo-Agathange: histoire ancienne de l'Arménie," see V. Langlois, *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie* (2 vols.: 1869-80), 1:195-200; for the long version, published under the title "Mar Apas Catina: histoire ancienne de l'Arménie," see *ibid.*, pp. 18-53, and also the first book of "Moïse de Chorène," *ibid.*, 2:53-78.

3. G. Abgarian, "Remarques sur l'histoire de Sebeos," *Revue des études arméniennes*, 1 (1964), pp. 203-15, where it is demonstrated that the real author of this work was probably the monk Khosrovik.

4. C. Toumanoff, "On the Date of Pseudo-Moses of Chorene," *Handes Amsorya* (Dec. 1961), pp. 468-76.

5. Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 306-16.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 307.

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 307-9, where the evidence on this question is discussed in detail.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 55n49.

9. Herodotus, *The Persian Wars*, 7.73.

10. Pseudo-Moses (I. 10) referred to Hayk as *i meřskayic'n*, 'one of the giants,' but, after demonstrating that several of the princely houses of Armenia were descended from him, felt obliged (III. 65) to deny that the princes were descended from gods, implying that in pre-Christian times Hayk himself was considered a god. Other traces of his cult as a divinity survived among the Christian Armenians; not only does he appear to have been the subject of religious veneration but he was of astrological

significance as well, for Hayk was the name given by the Armenians to the constellation Orion. See Toumanoff, *Studies*, p. 108n68.

11. Suren Saharuni, "On the Origins of the Armenians," *Armenian Review*, 13 (May 1960), p. 69.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 68.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.* For some other aspects of traditional accounts of Armenian origins see E.V. Gulbekian, "The Significance of the Narrative Describing the Traditional Origin of the Armenians," *Le Muséon*, 86 (1973), pp. 365-75.
15. Boris B. Piotrovsky, *The Ancient Civilization of Urartu* (New York, 1969), p. 85.
16. Zacharias the Rhetor, *Ecclesiastical Chronicle* (Eng. tr., London, 1889).
17. Plato, *Republic*, X.13.
18. Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, III, 1, 1:17.
19. Toumanoff, *Studies*, p. 109n168; *idem*, "Caucasia and Byzantium," *Traditio*, 27 (1971), p. 158.
20. For the best discussion of the Orontid dynasty see Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 277-305.
21. Strabo, II. 14, 15.
22. Toumanoff, *Studies*, p. 297.
23. Attempts to assign dates to the kings listed in the *Primary History* have not been wanting. Michael Chamich (Chamchian) in the eighteenth century was the first to address himself to this task, and his dates, adjusted by Saint-Martin, are in Langlois, *Collection*, 2:385. In this effort Hayk is dated to 2107 B.C. These dates were then revised by Jacques de Morgan in his *L'histoire du peuple arménien* (Paris, 1916; English translation, Boston, 1957), p. 401, where Hayk is dated to 2350 B.C., and this has been reproduced with less specific dates by Vahan Kurkjian, *A History of Armenia* (New York, 1958), p. 501. While there may be some excuse for Chamich's efforts, there is none for the two modern works.
24. Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 112ff., 139.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 108.
27. The confused nature of early Armenian historical traditions is evident even in Book II of Pseudo-Moses' work, which deals with events from the time of Alexander to after the conversion of Armenia to Christianity early in the fourth century A.D. Although this material is much more historical, there is still an astonishing degree of anachronism, confusion, and telescoping. Only in Book III do the data come into reasonably full accord with what we know from contemporaneous sources.

TABLE 1
The Early Rulers of Armenia: The Short Redaction

A	[1]	Haik of the race of Japhet
B	[2]	Armaniak (son of Haik)
C	[3]	Aramais (son of Armaniak)
D	[4]	Amassia (son of Aramais)
E	[5]	Gegham (son of Amassia)
F	[6]	Harma (son of Gegham)
G	[7]	Aram (son of Harma)
H	[8]	Ara (son of Aram and contemporary of Semiramis)
I	[50]	Zareh (a descendant of Zareh; governor under the Assyrians)
J	[51]	Armok (governor under the Assyrians)
K	[—]	Sarhank (governor under the Assyrians)
L	[21?]	Shavash (governor under the Assyrians)
M	[40]	P'arnavaz (contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar)
N	[52]	Bakam (son of P'arnavaz)
O		Biwrat (son of Bakam)

Figures in brackets refer to corresponding names in Table 2. The relationship of J, K, L, and M to I is not stated, but the inference seems to be that they were descended from him.

TABLE 2
The Early Rulers of Armenia: The Long Redaction

[1]	HAIK (son of Thogarma, son of Thiras, son of Gomer, son of Japhet, son of Noah)
[2]	ARMENAK (son of Haik)
[3]	ARMAIS (son of Armenak; his brothers Kadmos, Khor, and Manavaz, and his nephew Baz, son of Manavaz, are also mentioned)
[4]	AMASIA (son of Armais)
[5]	GEGHAM (son of Amasia)
[6]	HARMA (son of Gegham)
[7]	ARAM (son of Harma and contemporary of Abraham)
[8]	ARA (son of Aram and contemporary of Semiramis)
[9]	Ara II (son of Ara I)
[10]	Anushavan (son of Ara II)
[11]	Paret (son of Anushavan)
[12]	Arbak (son of Paret)
[13]	Zavan (son of Arbak and contemporary of Moses)
[14]	P'arnak (son of Zavan)
[15]	Sur (son of P'arnak)
[16]	Havanak (son of Sur)
[17]	Vashtak (son of Havanak)
[18]	Haikak I (son of Vashtak)
[19]	Ampak (son of Haikak I)
[20]	Arnak (son of Ampak)

Table 2 (continued)

- [21] Shavarsh (son of Arnak)
- [22] Norayr (son of Shavarsh)
- [23] Vstak (son of Norayr)
- [24] Kar (son of Vstak)
- [25] Gorak (son of Kar)
- [26] Hrant/Orontes (son of Gorak)
- [27] Entzak (son of Hrant and contemporary of Samson)
- [28] Gghak (son of Entzak)
- [29] Hore (son of Gghak)
- [30] Zarmayr (son of Hore and contemporary of both David and the Trojan War)
- [31] Berj (son of Zarmayr)
- [32] Arbun (son of Berj)
- [33] Bazuk (son of Arbun)
- [34] Hoy (son of Bazuk)
- [35] Husak (son of Hoy)
- [36] Kaypak (son of Husak)
- [37] Skayordi (son of Kaypak)
- [38] Paruyr (son of Skayordi and contemporary of Sardanapalus of Assyria)
- [39] Hrachia (son of Paruyr)
- [40] PARNUAS (son of Hrachia)
- [41] Bajuj (son of Parnuas)
- [42] Karnak (son of Bajuj)
- [43] Pavos (son of Karnak)
- [44] Haikak II (son of Pavos)
- [45] Hrvant/Orontes (son of Haikak II)
- [46] Tigran (son of Hrvant/Orontes and contemporary of Cyrus the Great)
- [47] Vahagn (son of Tigran)
- [48] Aravan (son of Vahagn)
- [49] Nerseh (son of Aravan)
- [50] ZAREH (son of Nerseh)
- [51] ARMOK (son of Zareh)
- [52] BAKAM (son of Armok)
- [53] Van (son of Bakam)
- [54] Vahe (son of Van; killed in battle with Alexander the Great)

Names in caps also appear in Table 1.

ՄԱՏԹԵՈՍ ՈՒՌՀԱՅԵՅԻ

ԺԱՄԱՆԱԿԱԳՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

Աշխարհաբար քարգմանությունը
և ծանոթագրությունները
Հրաչ Բարթիկյանի

Մատթեոս Ուոհայեցիին հայ միջնադարյան պատմագրության փայլուն դեմքերից մեկն է: Ծնվել է 11-րդ դարի երկրորդ կեսին Ուոհա քաղաքում, որտեղ և վախճանվել է 1188—1144 թվականների միջև, տարեց հասակում: Կարծիք է հայտնվել, որ նա զոհվել է Սիրիայի աթաբեկ Նուր էդ-դինի հոր՝ էմադ էդ-դին Զանգիի կողմից 1144 թ. Ուոհայի գրավման ժամանակ: Նա ապրել և ստեղծագործել է դեպքերով ու դեմքերով հարուստ, պետությունների և ժողովուրդների կյանքում ճակատագրական նշանակություն ունեցող իրադարձությունների ժամանակաշրջանում, որոնք և գրի է առել իր պատմական երկում:

Դժբախտաբար, մենք շատ քիչ քան գիտենք Մատթեոս Ուոհայեցու մասին, այն էլ մի քանի ինքնակենսագրական տողերից, որ հանդիպում են նրա երկում: Նա վաճակաւան էր, իր աշխատությունը հիմնականում գրել է Ուոհա քաղաքում, կյանքի վերջին տարիներին եղել է ճակատագրաբար: Իր երկասիրությունը, որ նա անվանում է «Ժամանակագրություն», սկսվում է 952 թ. և ավարտվում 1186/1187 թթ. դեպքերի նկարագրությամբ, ընդ որում քաժանվում է երեք մասի: Առաջին մասն ընդգրկում է 952—1051 թթ. դեպքերի նկարագրությունը, այսինքն՝ մեկ հարյուրամյակի պատմություն, երկրորդ մասը՝ 1051—1101 թթ.՝ հիսուն տարվա պատմություն, իսկ երրորդ մասը հասցնում է մինչև 1186/1187 թթ.:

«Ժամանակագրություն» սկսվում է երկրում տարածված սովի նկարագրությամբ: Եթե նկատի ունենանք երկրորդ և երրորդ մասերի սկզբում Ուոհայեցու թողած ներածական էջերը, ապա սպասելի էր, որ առաջին մասն էլ պետք է նման ներածություն ունենար: Բայց, դժբախտաբար, այն չի պահպանվել, գուցե և Ուոհայեցին ուզեցել է ամբողջ երկի ներածությունը վերջում գրել, քայց չի հասցրել:

Ուոհայեցու առջև լուրջ դժվարություններ էին կանգնած: Մեր միջնադարյան պատմիչների մեծամասնությունը գրել է զուտ հայոց պատմություն կամ նույնիսկ մի նահանգի պատմություն, այնինչ Ուոհայեցին, ապրելով հայ ժողովրդի համար արտակարգ բարդ մի ժամանակաշրջանում, չէր կարող նյութի այդպիսի ընդգրկմամբ բավարարվել: Նա ստիպված էր գրել ոչ միայն հայոց պատմությունը, այլև հայոց՝ հարևան ժողովուրդների հետ ունեցած փոխհարաբերությունների պատմությունը, որոնց հետ հայերը, ճակատագրի բերմամբ, ստիպված էին շփման մեջ մտնել: Վրաստան և Աղվանք, արաբական խալիֆայություն, հյուզանդիա, հուլաքիսիա, Եգիպտոսի Ֆաթիմյաններ, սելջուկ թուրքեր և թուրքական իշխանություններ, խաչակիրներ և խաչակրաց իշխանություններ, ամա ոչ լրիվ ցուցակը այն երկրների, թագավորությունների և իշխանությունների, որոնց պատմությանը նա այս կամ այն չափով պետք է անդրադառնար: Նա պետք է օգտվեր ոչ միայն

հայկական աղբյուրներից, այն պարտավոր էր դիմել բյուզանդական աղբյուրներին, ֆրանկ խաչակիրների գրվածքներին կամ հենց ֆրանկներին անձնապես՝ իմանալու այս կամ այն դեպքի մասին: Եվ նա այդ գործը հաջողությամբ է կատարել:

Սուաշին ժափ մեկդարյա պատմությունը նա շարադրել է «Հատ առաջ ծնված ականատես և ականջավոր եղած մարդկանց [ասածի] հիման վրա և հին պատմագիրների [գործերն] ընթերցելով, պատմագիրներ, ովքեր ականատես էին եղել բոլոր անցքերին»: Դժբախտաբար, նա չի տալիս իր օգտագործած պատմագիրներից և ոչ մեկի անունը: Տվյալ ժամանակաշրջանի մեզ հայտնի պատմագիրներից (Ծապուն Բագրատունի, Հովհաննես Դրասխանակերտցի, Ստեփանոս Տարոնեցի, Արիստակես Լաստիվերտցի) և ոչ մեկի գործը նա չի օգտագործել, պիտի ենթադրել, որ նրա ձեռքի տակ եղած աղբյուրները պարզապես չեն պահպանվել: Ամենայն հավանականությամբ նա օգտագործել է Հակոբ Սանահնեցու պատմական երկը: Ուոհայեցուց հայտնի է, որ Հակոբ Սանահնեցին իր կյանքի վերջին տարիները անց է կացրել Ուոհայում, ուր և վախճանվել է 1035 թ.: Հետևաբար, Ուոհայեցին կարող էր ոչ միայն օգտագործած լինել նրա ձեռագիր ժառանգությունը, այլ և անձնապես ծանոթ լինել նրան: Հավանաբար Հակոբ Սանահնեցու միջոցով է Ուոհայեցին ծանոթ Բագրատունիների թագավորական և Անիի կաթողիկոսարանի դիվանների մի շարք փաստաթղթերին (2մշկիկ կայսեր մամակները հայոց Աշոտ Գ թագավորին և հայոց Ղևոնդ վարդապետին, Վասիլ Բ կայսեր՝ Հովհաննես թագավորին և հայոց կաթողիկոս Սարգսին ուղարկած մամակները): Ինչ խոսք, Ուոհայեցին օգտված պիտի լինի նաև բյուզանդական աղբյուրներից անմիջականորեն, բայց կոնկրետ ինչ աղբյուրներից, առայժմ դժվար է ասել: Դժվար է ասել հատկապես 10—11-րդ դդ. պատմության վերաբերյալ, քանի որ Հակոբ Սանահնեցու «Ժամանակագրությունից» օգտվելու փաստը հնարավորություն չի տալիս որոշելու ինչն է Ուոհայեցին անմիջականորեն վերցրել բյուզանդական աղբյուրներից և ինչը՝ Սանահնեցու միջոցով:

Երկրորդ և երրորդ մասերում նկարագրված դեպքերի ժամանակակիցն է Ուոհայեցին. նա արդեն հանդես է գալիս որպես ականատես և ականջավոր հեղինակ: Նա իր քաղաքի, գավառի և մերձակա շրջաններում կատարված դեպքերին լավ տեղյակ է, այդ իմաստով նրա «Ժամանակագրության» այդ էջերը անգնահատելի արժեք ունեն և քարձր են գնահատվել ուսումնասիրողների կողմից:

Ուոհայեցու պատմական երկը «Ժամանակագրություն» է, ժամանակագրական հաջորդականությամբ շարադրված պատմություն: Ուոհայեցին դեպքերի ու դեմքերի սուկ արձանագրողը չէ, այլ ուսումնասիրող, նա իր ուրույն մոտեցումն ունի, գիտի գնահատել այս կամ այն անձնավորության քարի գործերը: Նա տարբերվում է մեր քաղում այլ պատմիչներից մի կարևոր առանձնահատկությամբ. նա լույս հայտնության պատմությունն է գրում, «Հայաստան ազգի» և «Հայաստան աշխարհի» պատմությունը: Եթե մեր մի շարք պատմիչների համար հայրենիքը ամենից առաջ նրանց բնիկ նահանգն է՝ Վասպուրականը, Սյունիքը, Ծիրակը, Տարոնը և այլն, Մատթեոս Ուոհայեցու համար հայրենիքը այդ բոլորի ամբողջությունն է, առանց սահմանների: Դեռ ավելին, Ուոհայեցին իր աշխատության մեջ մանրամասն տեղ է տալիս դեպքերի թերմամբ Հայաստանի սահմաններից դուրս ստեղծված հայ իշխանություններին, այդ թվում նաև հեռավոր Դերբենդում հաստատված իշխանությունը:

Մատթեոս Ուոհայեցու «Ժամանակագրությունը» շարունակել է Գրիգոր Երեցը, որը հասցրել է այն մինչև 1162/1163 թթ.: Վերջինիս մասին նույնպես քիչ բան է

հայտնի: Պարզապես գիտենք, որ քեսուցի երեք էր: Նա գրում է բյուզանդական կայսեր ասպատակությունների մասին Կիլիկիայում, Մոսուլի տեր Զանգիի կողմից: Եդեսիայի գրավման, ապա Կիլիկիայի հայկական իշխանության այլազգի սուլթանների հետ ունեցած փոխհարաբերությունների, ինչպես և հայ-վրացական կայսերի մասին այդ կարճ ժամանակահատվածում: Նրա Ժարունակության մեջ մեծ տեղ է գրավում Քեսուցի և Մարաշի ֆրանկ իշխան Բադդուհի անհայտ կորստյան (1148 թ.) առթիվ վերջինիս խոստովանահայր վարդապետ Բարսեղի գրած ընդարձակ ողբ-դամբանականը: Եթե պատմական փաստերով այն շատ է աղքատ և պատմաբանին քիչ նյութ է տալիս, ապա որպես հայ գրականության պատմության մեջ պահպանված նման ժանրի հազվագյուտ նմուշ, մեծ արժեք է ներկայացնում և՛ իր լեզվով, և՛ իր շարադրման ձևով:

Ուոհայեցու «Ժամանակագրությունը», Գրիգոր Երեցի Ժարունակությամբ հանդերձ, օգտագործել է Սմբատ Սպարապետը իր «Տարեգրքի» շարադրման ժամանակ: Նա պարզապես այդ ամբողջ գործի համառոտումն է կատարել: Ապրելով Ուոհայեցուց և Գրիգոր Երեցից մոտ մեկ դար անց, պարզ է, Սմբատ Սպարապետը ձեռքի տակ է ունեցել «Ժամանակագրության» եթե ոչ սկզբնագիրը, համեմայն դեպք, նրանցից անմիջապես արված մի ընթերցանություն, որ շատ ավելի հարազատ է բնագրին, քան մեր ձեռքի տակ եղած «Ժամանակագրության» գրչագրերը, որոնք բոլորն էլ, ըմբաստաբար, արտագրված են 17-րդ դարից ոչ առաջ: Այդ իմաստով Սմբատի «Տարեգրությունը» օգտակար է՝ սրբագրելու համար «Ժամանակագրության» գրիչների մեղքով աղավաղված մի շարք ընթերցումներ:

Ուոհայեցու «Ժամանակագրությունը» արդեն շուրջ երկու դար է, ինչ դարձել է պատմաբանների ուսումնասիրության առարկան: Ամբողջությամբ այն առաջին անգամ լույս է տեսել Էդ. Դյուլորիեի ֆրանսերեն թարգմանությամբ (*Chronique de Matthieu d' Edesse (952—1136), avec la Continuation de Grégoire le Prêtre jusqu' en 1162 ... par Ed. Dulaurier, Paris, 1858*): Միայն 1869 թ. է, որ «Ժամանակագրության» հայերեն բնագիրը առաջին անգամ լույս տեսավ (Պատմութիւն Մատթէոսի Ուոհայեցու, Երուսաղէմ, 1869): 1898 թ. «Ժամանակագրության» ավելի լիակատար բնագիրը բովանդակող Էջմիածնի Մայր Աթոռի № 1693 (այժմ Մաշտոցի անվան մատենադարանի № 1896 ձեռագիրը) գրչագրի հիման վրա Մամբրե վարդապետ Մելիք Ադամյանը և Ներսես սարկավազ Տեր-Միքայելյանը իրականացրին Մատթէոս Ուոհայեցու «Ժամանակագրության» երկրորդ հրատարակությունը: Սույն աշխարհաբար թարգմանությունը, որ առաջին անգամ լույս տեսավ 1973 թ., «Հայաստան» հրատարակչության «Հայ մատենագիրներ» մատենաշարով, կատարված է այդ բնագրի հիման վրա, նկատի առնելով ինչպես Երուսաղեմի հրատարակությունը, այնպես էլ Մատենադարանում պահվող մյուս գրչագրերը:

1962 թ. Անկարայում լույս տեսավ Մատթէոս Ուոհայեցու «Ժամանակագրության» թուրքերեն թարգմանությունը (Urfali Mateos Vekayināmesi (952—1136) ve Papaz Grigor' un zeyli (1136—1162). Türkçeye çeviren H. D. Andreasyan, notlar E. Dulaurier. M. Halil Yinanç çeviren, Ankara, 1962. Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayinlardan, II seri, 21): «Ժամանակագրությունն» ունի նաև անգլերեն թարգմանություն (A. E. Dostourian, The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa. Transl. from the original Armenian, with a Commentary and Introduction. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1972, 2 vols., pp. 752): Մատթէոս Ուոհայեցու «Ժամանակագրության» Վաղարշապատի հրատարակության բնագիրը, որի հիման վրա է

կատարված սույն թարգմանությունը, կրում է հետևյալ վերնագիրը. «Պատմություն արարելալ Մատթեոսի Մեծի քահանայի Ռոհայեցույ վասն Բագրատունեաց թագաւորացն և այլոց բազմաց ի ԴՃ (400/951) թուականէն սկսեալ մինչև ի ՌԺԱ (611/1162) թին ասարտեալ»: Ռոհայեցին իր երկում հանդիպող սակալ ինքնակենսագրական տողերում, երբ տեղի-անտեղի աշխատում է ընդգծել իր նվաստությունը, գիտելիքների սակավությունը և տկարությունը, գրքի ճակատին իրեն «Մեծ քահանա» չէր անվանի: Ռոհայեցու «Ժամանակագրությունը» հասցվում է մինչև հայոց տոմարի 585 (1186) թվականը, այնինչ, խնդրո առարկա վերնագրում ցույց է տրված, որ տվյալ երկն, իբր, ընդգրկում է մինչև հայոց տոմարի 611 (1162) թվականն ընկած դեպքերի շարադրանքը: Պարզ է, որ գիրքը վերնագրող գրիչը չի էլ իմացել, որ 1186 թ. հետո ընկած դեպքերի շարադրանքը պատկանում է ոչ թե Ռոհայեցու, այլ Գրիգոր Երեցի գրչին: Եվ, վերջապես, ինքը՝ Մատթեոս Ռոհայեցին, իր աշխատանքն անվանում է ոչ թե «Պատմություն», այլ «Ժամանակագրություն»:

1 Ռոհայեցին օգտագործում է հայոց թվականը: Փակագծերում մենք ցույց ենք տալիս, թե Ռոհայեցու նշած թվականը ներկայումս գործածվող ո՛ր թվականին է համապատասխանում՝ ըստ Լդ. Դյուլոբիեի:

2 «Տաճիկ» ցեղանունը հայ մատենագրության մեջ սկզբնական շրջանում օգտագործվում էր «արաբ» նշանակությամբ, հետագայում սկսեց նշանակել «պարսիկ»՝ ի հակադրություն «թուրքի»: Այժմ «տաճիկ» «թուրք» է նշանակում:

3 Ռոհան կամ Եղեսիան գոյություն է ունեցել Տիգրան թագավորից, գուցե և մակեդոնացիների տիրապետությունից էլ առաջ: Արաբական տիրապետության տակ մնաց մինչև 1032 թ., երբ այն գրավվեց գորավար Մանիակի կողմից:

4 Ամուր՝ քաղաք Եփրատ գետի աջ ափին, Էմեսսայից (այժմ՝ Հոմս) հյուսիս-արևմուտք: Արաբների ձեռքում մնաց մինչև 934 թ. և բյուզանդացիներին անցավ հալազի նշանավոր գորավար Հովհաննես Կուրկուսի ջանքերով:

5 Պատականանոսը (ճիշտ՝ պարսկիմոմենոս) անուն չէ, այլ պաշտոն: Այդպես էր կոչվում բյուզանդական կայսեր սենեկապետը: Այստեղ խոսքը պարսկիմոմենոս Վասիլ Լեկապենոսի մասին է, Ռոմանոս Ա կայսեր ապօրինի որդու:

6 Օվկիանոս ծով անվան տակ Ռոհայեցին տվյալ դեպքում նկատի ունի Էգեական ծովը, թեև այդ բառի տակ, որպես կանոն, ենթադրվում է ողջ Միջերկրականը:

7 Ռոհայեցու նշած արշավանքին, երբ կղզին նորից անցավ բյուզանդացիների ձեռքը, Ռոմանոսը չէր մասնակցում. այդ արշավանքը գլխավորում էր Արևելից գորքերի սպարապետ, հալազի Նիկեփոր Փոկասը, որը մի քանի տարի անց կայսր հռչակվեց: Ռոհայեցու տեղեկությունը՝ Կրետեի արաբների ձեռքում 400 տարի մնալու մասին, ճիշտ չէ:

8 Համտունը Հալեայի ամիրան էր, որին առաջին անգամ ջարդ տվեց Նիկեփոր Փոկասը: Երբ վերջինս Կրետեում էր գտնվում, Ռոմանոս կայսրը արաբական վտանգի առաջն առնելու համար նրանց դեմ ուղարկեց Նիկեփոր Փոկասի եղբորը՝ Լևոն Փոկասին, նրան տալով մագիստրոսի բարձր պատվաստիճանը և նշանակելով Արևելից սպարապետ: Մատթեոս Ռոհայեցու վկայությունը, թեև համառոտ, արժե-

DUMBARTON OAKS

The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa: Apocalypse, the First Crusade, and the Armenian Diaspora

Author(s): Christopher MacEvitt

Source: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 61 (2007), pp. 157-181

Published by: [Dumbarton Oaks, Trustees for Harvard University](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25472048>

Accessed: 03/04/2013 07:28

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Dumbarton Oaks, Trustees for Harvard University is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa: Apocalypse, the First Crusade, and the Armenian Diaspora

Christopher MacEvitt

IN 1066/7, A TURKISH EMIR named Afshin¹ led his troops on a raid on the numerous monasteries of the Amanus mountains, north on Antioch.² The result, mourned the twelfth-century Armenian chronicler Matt'eos Urhayets'i (Matthew of Edessa, ca. 1070–ca. 1136), was that “many of the holy monks were subjected to the edge of the sword and to being burned; moreover, their corpses became food for the beasts and the birds.”³ Despite the holiness of the monks, their suffering and death fulfilled divine will, accomplishing the words of Psalm 78: “Their young men were devoured by fire and no one grieved for their virgins; their priests fell under the sword and no one grieved for their widows.”⁴ The biblical verses appeared as more than a rhetorical flourish from a clerical writer: they evoked themes woven throughout Matthew’s chronicle. While the immolated youths and the slain priests of Psalm 78 died by the will of their own wrathful God, the psalm ended with a comforting evocation of God’s love for the tribe of Judah and for his servant David. Similarly, Matthew’s chronicle depicted an angry God punishing his wayward flock (Christian Armenians), but ultimately it focused on an abiding sense of the imminent arrival of the end of the world and the attendant promise of redemption.

The massacre on the mountains was evidence in a long list of violent episodes that proved that Matthew lived in a dark era dominated by God’s wrath. Like other Christian chroniclers, including Hydatius of fifth-century Hispania and Ralph Glaber of eleventh-century Burgundy,⁵ Matthew was inspired to write by the sense of living at the turn of the ages, watching the ancient, corrupt order peel away and the new, perhaps glorious, perhaps terrifying, emerge. All

¹ Named Oshen in the 1898 edition, and Evshen in the 1869 Jerusalem edition of Matthew’s text, *Patmut’iwn* (Jerusalem, 1869), 223. Dostourian surmises that this is a version of the Persian name Afshin.

² Throughout this article, I will be citing the Armenian text of Matthew of Edessa’s chronicle, using the 1898 Vagharshapat edition, which, as discussed below, relies upon the largest number of manuscripts and includes some critical apparatus: Matt’eos Urhayets’i [Matthew of Edessa], *Zhamanakagrut’iwn* (Vagharshapat, 1898),

hereafter Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*. All translations, unless otherwise noted, are from Ara Dostourian’s English translation: Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia and the Crusades*, trans. A. E. Dostourian (Lanham, Md., 1993), hereafter Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*.

³ Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 185; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 125.

⁴ Ps. 78: 63–64. This passage also evokes Ps. 79: 2–3: “Their blood flowed like water all around Jerusalem and there was no one

to bury them” (Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 186; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 125).

⁵ R. W. Burgess, ed. and trans., *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana* (Oxford, 1993); Burgess, “Hydatius and the Final Frontier: The Fall of the Roman Empire and the End of the World,” in *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity*, ed. R. W. Mathisen and H. S. Sivan (Aldershot, 1996), 321–32; Rodulphus Glaber, *The Five Books of the Histories*, trans. J. France and P. Reynolds (Oxford, 1989).

three chroniclers faced the challenge of reconciling faith in a triumphalist Christianity with defeat, disaster, or occupation. Matthew's apocalyptic focus has received little attention, unlike Hydatius's and Ralph's. Only by placing Matthew within his cultural context, that of a diasporic Armenian community coming to terms with the effects of the First Crusade, can we understand how Matthew understood the suffering of the Armenians and unravel his seemingly contradictory depiction of non-Armenians.

Writing between 1101/2 and the 1130s while Edessa was under Frankish rule, Matthew took as the subject of his chronicle "the horrible punishment (*barkut'iwn*), which the Armenian nation endured at the hands of the long-haired and abominable Elamites, the nation of the Turks, and their brothers, the Romans."⁶ The Turks and the Byzantines (and later the Franks) were at the same time agents of divine retribution, the foot soldiers of Satan's army, and the victims of the same punishments as the Armenians. Episodes of violence punctuate Matthew's history with metronomic regularity. Not simply an account of events, his chronicle is a prehistory of the Apocalypse, and violence is the muscle that gives his history motion. Matthew drew his expectations of the coming Apocalypse from a number of sources, the most important of which was the Syriac account by an anonymous seventh-century author now referred to as pseudo-Methodius.⁷ One of the most influential apocalypses of the medieval period, it introduced the figure of the last emperor, who would defeat the infidel people who oppressed Christians and then place his crown on the Holy Cross at Golgotha, allowing the return of Christ. The narrative spread quickly, becoming a part of Byzantine and western Christian apocalyptic traditions as well. Matthew, however, employed apocalyptic signs and narratives with a different intent than did many other medieval apocalypticists; his intent was not to strengthen the bulwarks of an embattled community, but to make clear its fragility and fast-approaching demise. Yet that demise would not be the result of Turkish massacres or Byzantine duplicity.

6 Matthew uses the word *barkut'iwn*, meaning "anger, punishment, or calamity," both here and throughout his chronicle to describe the suffering of the Armenians (Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 112–13; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 83).

7 P. Alexander, *Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition* (Berkeley, 1985); G. J. Reinink, *Die Syrische Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodius* (Leuven, 1993); and W. J. Aerts and G. A. A. Kortekaas, *Die Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodius: die Ältesten Griechischen und*

Lateinischen Übersetzungen, 2 vols. (Leuven, 1998); C. Villagomez, "Christian Salvation through Muslim Domination: Divine Punishment and Syriac Apocalyptic Expectation in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries," *MedE* 4 (1998): 203–18. The figure of the "last emperor" does not appear in the Armenian tradition until the later tenth century, and then in a revised version of the *Life of Nerses*, a frequently edited text concerning the prophecies of the fourth-century Armenian patriarch, translated by

J.-R. Emine, "Généalogie de la famille de saint Grégoire et vie de saint Nersès," in *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie*, ed. V. Langlois (Paris, 1969), 2: 21–41; R. Thomson, "Crusades through Armenian Eyes," in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, ed. A. E. Laiou and R. Parviz Mottahedeh (Washington, D. C., 2001), 74–75. For further bibliography on apocalypticism, see note 85.

Matthew's apocalyptic fears arose from the disquieting sense that Armenians, particularly those living in diasporic communities such as Edessa, were fading from sight, bleached out by Byzantine, Frankish, and Turkish cultural radiation. The chronicle is Matthew's search for an explanation of why Armenians were becoming indistinguishable from their neighbors and rulers; he cast the answer in the language of violence, which often stood in for the cultural violence Matthew felt Armenians were suffering.

Paradoxically, the description and memory of violence in Matthew's work was a product of a society in which the boundaries separating one religious and ethnic community from another were transparent, crossed and recrossed by soldiers, generals, and aristocrats with little sense of any change. Matthew pointed out that Armenians inflicted suffering on each other as often as the Turks or Byzantines did, and to him such "betrayals" were the most fascinating and revealing kind of violence. His real concern was thus Armenian society, proud of its ancient heritage but blind to its current calamities, consuming itself in betrayal and backstabbing.

Historiography

Matthew's chronicle has been used widely by Byzantinists and Islamicists, as well as by historians of medieval Armenia and of the crusades, for the better part of two centuries; it is arguably one of the most important historical narratives from twelfth-century Syria. Portions of Matthew's chronicle have been available in translation since François Martin and Jacques Chahan de Cirbied (1772–1834) first translated it in 1811.⁸ In a sense, however, Martin did not translate Matthew at all; he published that part of Matthew's work that purported to be a transcription of a letter written by the Byzantine emperor John I Tzimiskes (969–976) to the Armenian king Ashot III (952–977). Matthew's debut in the academic world was thus in Byzantine dress. Édouard Dulaurier (1807–1881) published a complete translation of the chronicle in 1858, portions of which were included in the *Recueil des historiens des croisades* in 1869.⁹ The first edition of the Armenian text was published in Jerusalem in 1869, based on two

8 Matthew of Edessa, *Détails historiques de la première expédition des Chrétiens dans la Palestine sous l'empereur Zimiscès*, trans. F. Martin, notes by J. Chahan de Cirbied (Paris, 1811). A second excerpt, focusing on the First Crusade, was published a year later: *Notice de deux manuscrits arméniens contenant l'histoire de Mathieu Eretz et extrait de cette histoire, relatif à la première croisade en arménien et en français* (Paris, 1812).

9 Matthew of Edessa, *Chronique de Matthieu d'Édesse (962–1136)*, trans. É. Dulaurier (Paris, 1858); *Recueil des historiens des croisades, Documents arméniens* (Paris, 1869), 1: 4–150. Dulaurier, however, first published extracts concerning the First Crusade in 1850 (Matthew of Edessa, *Récit de la première croisade*, trans. É. Dulaurier [Paris, 1850]). Dulaurier's translation, however, left out some episodes included in other

editions. His translation was used widely until supplemented by Ara Dostourian's English translation published in 1993 (cited above, n. 2). It was also translated into Turkish by H. Andreasyan (*Urfalı Mateos vekayinâmesi [952–1136] ve Papaz Grigor'un Zeyli [1136–1162]* [Ankara, 1962]).

manuscripts, and another published in Vagharshapat (Etchmiadzin) in Armenia in 1898, based on five manuscripts as well as on the Jerusalem edition.¹⁰ Despite its availability, historians have paid little attention to the internal logic and concerns of the text itself, and instead have used it to corroborate events described in Arabic, Greek, and Latin sources. Aside from the introductions to the French and English translations of the work by Édouard Dulaurier in 1858 and Ara Dostourian in 1993, this is the first critical analysis of Matthew's chronicle in any major European language.¹¹

Matthew has sat on the historiographic sidelines for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the language in which he wrote—medieval Armenian. Armenian is generally not one of the primary languages historians of the twelfth-century Middle East consider learning, nor is the twelfth-century Middle East one of the areas Armenologists consider within their realm of expertise. Like the proverbial bridesmaid, Matthew is often cited, but never studied. Examining only the events and dates of specific interest to them, scholars have never confronted Matthew's larger historical agenda. As a result of such normative readings of his text, Matthew's reputation generally has been that of a prejudiced and therefore unreliable historian. The French Armenologist Joseph Laurent, in one of the first careful studies of eleventh-century Edessan history, commented, "Matthew does not merit a blind confidence without study," worrying that perhaps the original text had been altered over time, for it lacked order and organization.¹² In his magisterial work on northern Syria, Claude Cahen suggested that Matthew had "an insatiable hatred of the Greeks."¹³ More recently Mark Whittow concurred, considering Matthew to be "anti-Chalcedonian and anti-Byzantine."¹⁴ Accusations of inaccuracy are perhaps not the best form of criticism of Matthew, or of any medieval chronicle. The text is best read not as a description of a world containing discrete and differentiated peoples and cultures, but prescriptively as an attempt to shape a protean cultural landscape into such a world.

10 The 1898 edition was republished in 1991 with a modern Armenian translation by H. Bartik'yan (Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, ed. M. Melik-Adamyanyan and N. Ter-Mik'ayelyan [Erevan, 1991]).

11 Brief comments appear in H. Berberian, "Comptes rendus," *RÉA* 10 (1973–74): 403–6; H. Adjarian, "Matt'eos Urhayec'i," *HA* 67 (1953): 350–54 [in Armenian]; Anneliese Lüders, *Die Kreuzzüge im Urteil syrischer und armenischer Quellen* (Berlin, 1964), 17–19.

12 J. Laurent, "Des Grecs aux Croisés. Étude sur l'histoire d'Édesse entre 1071 et 1098," *Byzantion* 1 (1921): 372–73, reprinted in *Études d'histoire arménienne* (Leuven, 1971), 66–67.

13 C. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque* (Paris, 1940), 98; Steven Runciman also follows this line, *History of the Crusades* (Cambridge, 1952), 2: 483. Modern surveys of crusader and Byzantine history scarcely mention Matthew.

14 M. Whittow, *The Making of Byzantium, 600–1025* (Berkeley, 1996), 383.

Structure of the Chronicle

Matthew's apocalyptic interests explain the numerological drumbeat underlying the tripartite structure of his chronicle, a structure that echoes other Armenian historians such as Movses Xorenats'i, T'ovma Artsruni, and Yovhannes Drasxanakerts'i.¹⁵ Each section covers half the time of the section preceding it, signaling the ascending sequence of violence directed against Armenian individuals and communities.¹⁶ Matthew himself noted the quickening chronological pulse of the world, acknowledging that "we also have become aware of time passing by very quickly, showing us change, decay, and disappearance of what exists and revealing to us the instability of mankind on earth."¹⁷ The first section describes the disappearance of Armenian royal authority in the Caucasus Mountains and eastern highlands through Byzantine subterfuge and Turkish aggression. The second section details the subsequent destruction of Armenian communities at the hands of the Turks, and in the third section Matthew prepares his readers for the coming Apocalypse.

About Matthew himself we know little. He called himself a "monk"¹⁸ as well as a "monastic priest,"¹⁹ though he never named his monastery.²⁰ He also used the epithet "Urhayets'i" (of Edessa), but never clarified whether he was born in Edessa, or whether his monastery was located there, or both. At some point he moved to the town of K'esun, approximately one hundred miles northwest of Edessa; the last entry in his chronicle, dated to 1136/7, detailed, unusually in the first person, a Turkish attack on the town.²¹ He likely died soon

15 J.-P. Mahé, "Entre Moïse et Mahomet: Réflexions sur l'historiographie arménienne," *RÉA* 23 (1992): 121–53.

16 The years covered in each part reflected Matthew's interest in numerological approaches to the Apocalypse. The first portion covers the years 952/3 to 1051/2 (Armenian years [AY] 401–500), the second from 1051/2 to 1101/2 (AY 500–550), and the third from 1101/2 to 1136/7 (AY 550–85); thus each portion covers roughly half the period of time of the previous section. Although the second and third sections include an authorial preface, in which Matthew outlined the sources used for the section, as well as explaining how it fit into his historical progression, the first section launches into a historical narrative unpreluded. It is tempting to speculate that the first portion of the chronicle has been lost, including an introduction as well as an account for the year 951/2 (AY 400).

The account concludes in 1136/7 (AY 585), although Matthew indicated his intention to end it in 1131/2 (AY 580) (Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwun*, 278–80; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 182–83).

17 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwun*, 282; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 184.

18 *Vanakan*; Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwun*, 113; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 83.

19 Ara Dostourian translates this (in Armenian *erits' vanats'*) as "superior of a monastery," which suggests that Matthew was abbot, but he does not describe other abbots with those words. The modern Armenian translation suggests "chaplain" (*vanerets'*); perhaps the best translation might be "monastic priest." [I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for this recommendation.] (Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwun*,

126; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 84).

20 The monastery most prominent in Matthew's account is Karmir Vank' (the "Red Monastery") near K'esun, and while Matthew never directly links himself to the monastery, it was patronized by Kogh Vasil and was the seat of the Pahlavunis in the area. *Kat'olikos* Gregory III Pahlavuni was consecrated here in 1113/4 (Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwun*, 329–30; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 215). As discussed below, Matthew promoted both Vasil and the Pahlavuni family, and a shared connection to the monastery may further explain his enthusiasm.

21 Matthew referred to Baldwin of Marash, who ruled K'esun, as "our prince" and spoke of God having mercy on the town despite "our sins" (Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwun*, 368; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 238–39).

after, for his continuator, Gregory the Priest, began his narrative the following year.

It is difficult to be certain when Matthew first began his chronicle. I offer a possible argument, but we do not have sufficient information to be certain. In the introduction to his third section, Matthew listed those patriarchs who were ruling “when my history was begun.”²² Unfortunately, few of the ordination or death dates of the patriarchs given restrict the range of possibilities for the beginning of the chronicle. For example, the career of Symeon II, Greek Orthodox patriarch of Jerusalem (1092–99), is the shortest reign of the five patriarchs listed. However, both the dates of Symeon’s ordination as patriarch and his death are poorly substantiated,²³ and we cannot be certain when Matthew believed Symeon held his position. However, Matthew also noted that the year was 6610 *anno mundi*, which produces the date of 1102.²⁴ Furthermore, Matthew began this portion of his chronicle with the Armenian year (AY) of 550, which also equals 1101/2. The majority of evidence, therefore, suggests that Matthew began his chronicle in 1101/2, and this is the date I follow.²⁵

We can thus gain a rough sense of how long Matthew spent writing his chronicle. In the introduction to his second section, Matthew announced that he has been writing for eight years; thus he completed the first section of his work (covering the years AY 401–500 [952/3–1051/2]) in the year 1109/1110. He further indicated that he had eighty more years to chronicle, giving an intended completion date of AY 580 (1131/2).²⁶

Then in his forties, the monk anticipated another two decades of important historical events leading to the Apocalypse. At the beginning of his third section, Matthew tells us he has now been writing for fifteen years, and again signals his intention to end his chronicle in AY 580, indicating that the year at that time was 1116/7.²⁷ His account actually concluded in 1136/7 (AY 585), five years later than he anticipated, though the account of these additional five years is brief.

Matthew’s intended audience was the Armenians of northern Syria, and his narrative frequently noted events in Edessa and surrounding areas. Only the last section of his chronicle, however, took northern Syria during Matthew’s own life as its primary focus. As

22 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 277; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 181.

23 Johannes Pahlitzsch, “Symeon II. und die Errichtung der lateinischen Kirche von Jerusalem durch die Kreuzfahrer,” in *Militia Sancti Sepulcri: Idea e Istituzioni*, ed. Kaspar Elm and Cosimo Damiano Fonseca [Vatican City, 1998], 341–60.

24 The monk further confused his chronology by adding that “we have not included these last ten years in our chronological considerations”; it is not evident what the chronicler intended by this.

25 Yet Berbérian (“Comptes rendus,” 404) suggests that Matthew began his chronicle in 1113, though he does not give details.

26 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 113–14; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 83.

27 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 278; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 182.

noted earlier, the first two sections were largely dedicated to events in the Armenian kingdoms of the Caucasus Mountains and around Lake Van during the tenth and eleventh centuries. This choice can be ascribed, at least in part, to caution; Matthew himself (perhaps hyperbolically) warned that writing about current events was fraught with peril, noting that “we would like to write about [the Franks’] many malicious deeds, but dare not, since we are under their authority.”²⁸

Matthew, however, may have preferred writing about the past and the distant rather than about his own time and place because in the past he could most easily distinguish the apocalyptic violence he sought. From his perspective, the disappearance of the Armenian kingdoms, particularly the Bagratuni kingdom of Ani, was the most traumatic of the “horrible punishments” the Armenians were fated to suffer. Matthew used the Turkish siege and capture of the Armenian city of Artsn in 1049/50, “the beginning of the misfortunes of the Armenians,” to urge his readers to “listen and pay attention to this account of the end and decay of the East—by slow degrees, year by year; for Artsn was the first town which was captured from the Armenians and put to the sword and enslaved.”²⁹ Matthew notably did not ascribe Artsn’s sack and the massacre and enslavement of its citizens to the city’s sinfulness, as did the eleventh-century chronicler Aristakes Lastivertts’i.³⁰ Rather, the city’s destruction was a sign of the beginning of a disastrous age. Following Artsn as victims in his litany of punishments were smaller communities such as the aforementioned monasteries in the Amanus Mountains, as well as other cities such as Melitene, Sebasteia, and, finally, in 1064/5 the city Matthew considered the cultural and religious heart of Armenia—Ani. His own city of Edessa had been spared the sieges and massacres others had suffered, but Matthew sought to impress upon his audience the sense that, as Armenians, they were strangers, describing them as “left guardianless in an alien land, since they left their ancestral home.”³¹

Two other, more immediate concerns also inspired Matthew to begin his chronicle. The first was the surprising appearance and success of the First Crusade. The crusades, and the political settlements they produced, were a challenge to Matthew’s sense of a world

28 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 239; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 221. See also R. Landes, *Relics, Apocalypse, and the Deceits of History: Adémar of Chabannes, 989–1034* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995), 142–43. In my understanding of Matthew’s view of the past, I have

also been influenced by P. J. Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton, 1994).

29 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 103; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 76–77.

30 Aristakes Lastivertts’i, *Patmut’iwn* (Venice, 1901), 64–69.

31 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 300; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 196.

dominated by the “three nations”—Armenians, Byzantines, and Turks—who were the putative subjects of his chronicle. Although Matthew never accorded the Franks the same status as the other three, he came to know them better than the Byzantines or the Turks. Matthew was likely resident in Edessa when the city came under the rule of Baldwin of Boulogne in 1098, and the Armenian monk spent the remainder of his life under Frankish rule, devoting a considerable portion of the third section of his chronicle to their deeds. Matthew began his work in 1101/2, soon after the First Crusade; its violence, unexpectedness, and even more surprising success likely provided Matthew with the final evidence needed to confirm his sense of a world undergoing momentous change.

The presence of two *kat'oliki*³² of the Pahlavuni family in early-twelfth-century northern Syria provided Matthew with further incentive to write. The aristocratic Pahlavunis had established a near monopoly on the office of the *kat'olikos*, or patriarch of the Armenian church, in the latter half of the eleventh century. The valiant deeds of the family, a narrative thread running through Matthew's chronicle, provided a connection between events in Armenia (particularly in the kingdom of Ani), and in northern Syria. The origins of the family are obscure,³³ but by the late tenth century they were among the leading aristocrats of the Bagratuni kingdom of Ani. Beginning with Vasak Pahlavuni (d. 1021), *sparapet* (military commander) of Ani, Matthew recounted the family's accomplishments, focusing on a series of prominent members: Vahram (d. 1047), successor to his brother Vasak as *sparapet*,³⁴ Vasak's son Gregory Magistros (d. 1058), *littérateur* and *doux* of Byzantine Mesopotamia,³⁵ Gregory's son Vahram (d. 1105), who became the first Pahlavuni patriarch in

32 Correctly transliterated as *kat'ughikos*, but here I use the more familiar Greek-based plural rather than the Armenian *kat'ughikosk'.*

33 Cyril Toumanoff gives the Pahlavunis connections to the ancient Kamsarakan family and thus to the family of Saint Gregory the Illuminator, the founder of Christianity in Armenia, but this genealogy is dubious; see his *Studies in Christian Caucasian History* (Washington, D.C., 1963), 207. The family themselves claimed the connection, perhaps as a way to solidify their hold on the catholicate. Movses Khorenats'i (of

Chorene), a historian whose writings have been dated anywhere from the fifth to the eighth century, recorded that both Saint Gregory and the Kamsarakans were descended from the Iranian Pahlavids; see Moses Khorenats'i, *History of the Armenians*, trans. R. W. Thomson (Cambridge, Mass., 1978), 2: 27, 165. While their surname evoked the Arsacid monarchy, Pahlav being both an area in Iran and the name of the two branches of the Arsacid family, the Pahlavunis emerged only in the tenth century and cannot be linked to the Kamsarakans with any certainty.

34 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 98; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 74. See the genealogical chart in M. Leroy, “Grégoire Magistros et les traductions arméniennes d'auteurs grecs,” *AIPHOS* 3 (1935): 263–94.

35 A. Sanjian, “Gregory Magistros: An Armenian Hellenist,” in *TO EAAHNIKON: Studies in Honor of Speros Vryonis, Jr.*, vol. 2, *Byzantinoslavica, Armeniaca, Islamica, the Balkans and Modern Greece*, ed. J. S. Allen et al. (New Rochelle, N.Y., 1993), 131–58; Leroy, “Grégoire Magistros,” 263–94; B. L. Chukaszyn, “Échos de légendes épiques iraniennes dans les «lettres» de Grigor Magistros,” *RÉArm* 1 (1964): 321–29.

1065–66 under the name Gregory II,³⁶ and Gregory's second son Vasak (d. 1077), *doux* of Byzantine Antioch.³⁷ *Kat'olikos* Gregory II consecrated his two nephews and a grandnephew as bishops during his lifetime, and two of them consecutively succeeded him to the patriarchate. In contrast to his attitude toward almost all other leaders or groups, Matthew rarely criticized the Pahlavunis; even when Gregory II decided to abandon his patriarchal duties to live an eremitic life, which led to a schism in the church, Matthew admired his determination to take on a life of solitude, and only lightly chastised him for his subsequent hostility to his replacement, the *vardapet* George, "for he forgot the vow he had taken to be George's companion in the spiritual life."³⁸

Matthew's first contact with the Pahlavunis may have come around 1103/4, shortly after he began his chronicle. In that year, the *kat'olikos* Barsegh Pahlavuni (nephew of Gregory II) came to Edessa, welcomed by the Frankish count Baldwin II.³⁹ Matthew was likely still living in the city at the time, and given the prominent place of the Pahlavunis in Matthew's chronicle, the patriarch may have provided some encouragement, material or otherwise, toward Matthew's project. Their association deepened when both Barsegh and Matthew took up residence in the town of K'esun some years later.⁴⁰ One hundred miles northwest of Edessa, K'esun was the center of a local Armenian *renovatio* in the early twelfth century. Barsegh's uncle Gregory II, after

36 Often known with the epithet *Vkayaser*, meaning "lover of the martyrs," for his numerous translations of such stories from Greek and Syriac into Armenian; see Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 155–56; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 106–7. For a general biography and outline of his travels, see A. Kapoian-Kouymjian, *L'Égypte vue par des Arméniens* (Paris, 1988), 7–93.

37 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 213–14; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 141.

38 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 190–91; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 127–28. A *vardapet* is a unique rank within the Armenian church. It is essentially a scholarly position, invested with the authority to teach, and ranked second only to that of the bishop. Although the position did not have any sacramental duties attached to it, *vardapets* did have the power to excommunicate. Some historians have linked the institution to the office of the *herbad*, which fulfilled an analogous role

in Zoroastrianism; see R. Thomson, "Vardapet in the Early Armenian Church," *Le Muséon* 75 (1962): 367–84.

39 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 294; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 192. The annexation of the kingdom of Ani spurred a period of nomadism on the part of the patriarchs, and the political confusions of the late eleventh century brought schism to the church—at one time four different *kat'olikoi* were exercising their authority under the protection of various Armenian and Muslim princes. Barsegh had visited Edessa some ten years earlier (1091/2), while the city was still under Turkish control. It is possible that this visit also had an impact on Matthew; see Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 241; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 157.

40 Dulaurier, *Chronique*, ix–x. It is unclear when Matthew left Edessa for K'esun. He was still in Edessa when he began the third and last part of his chronicle

in 1116, but the last entry in his chronicle recounts an attack on K'esun by the Danishmend sultan Muhammad, and in a rare moment, Matthew turns to the first person: "God, who is compassionate and merciful in all things, in spite of our sins did not will that we fall into the hands of the enemy; rather he took pity on us . . . and so did not give the command for the infidels to attack the town" (Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 367; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 238). Matthew's continuator Gregory also lived in K'esun, further suggesting that Matthew, at the end of his life at least, was living there. At the time of his death in 1113/4, Barsegh was residing in Behesni, a town only a few dozen miles to the north of K'esun. An assembly of bishops consecrated his nephew Gregory as his successor at the monastery of Karmir Vank', also situated in the territory of K'esun: Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 329–30; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 215.

years of traveling throughout the eastern Mediterranean, first took up residence in the city, dying there in 1105/6.⁴¹ Whether inspired by the Pahlavunis or by K'esun's Armenian ruler Kogh⁴² Vasil, Matthew enthusiastically promoted the city as the successor to the cultural and military glories of Ani. He found great satisfaction in noting that while the Franks of Edessa suffered defeat after defeat at the hands of the Turks, Vasil was defending Christians and winning victories at Turkish expense. Vasil "brought together a regiment of Armenian troops; and brave as lions or lion cubs, these soldiers rushed against the infidels," decisively defeating them and capturing a number of prisoners and vast amounts of booty.⁴³ Lists of the great fighters in Vasil's army, such as his adopted son Vasil Dgha, his nephew Petros, and the warriors Aplasar' and Tiran, further fostered a heroic image. After Vasil's death in 1112/3, Matthew recalled that "around this prince were united the remnants of the Armenian army, members of the Bagratuni and Pahlavuni families, sons of the kings of Armenia, and finally all those of Pahlavuni lineage, together with the military aristocracy of Armenia."⁴⁴

While Matthew's language echoed his earlier praise of Bagratuni heroes and linked Kogh Vasil to a bygone era, Vasil himself arose from humble origins; *kogh* (*gogh*) is an Armenian epithet meaning "robber." Matthew nevertheless claimed for him the majesty and proud heritage of the storied Armenian aristocracy through his unnamed wife, whom he suggested belonged to the ancient Kamsarakan family.⁴⁵ Her unlikely ancestry conveniently connected Vasil to the Pahlavunis and also to St. Gregory the Illuminator, the revered founder of Armenian Christianity, placing the Pahlavunis and Kogh Vasil's family as the leaders of a new Armenian society centered on K'esun. Matthew's promotion of the Pahlavunis and Kogh Vasil was tinged with the sweetness of nostalgia, for Kogh Vasil's principality fell to the combined hostilities of other Armenian lords and the Franks soon after Vasil's death in 1112/3. By the time Matthew began in 1116/7 to write the third section of his chronicle containing his descriptions of K'esun and Kogh Vasil, those heady days were gone, replaced by what he considered the comparatively grim rule of the Franks.

41 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'wn*, 298–99; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 195–96. See also Kapoian-Kouymjian, *L'Égypte vue par des Arméniens*, 7–93.

42 Properly transliterated as "gogh," but commonly as "kogh."

43 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'wn*, 306–7; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 200–201. Other chronicles do not mention these Armenian victories.

44 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'wn*, 323–24; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 211.

45 As with the Pahlavunis, this claim would seem to be at the least an exaggeration. Kamsarakan glory faded after the disastrous aristocratic rebellion in 775–76 against the 'Abbāsids, and thereafter the family disappeared from the historical record; possibly they lingered on as minor nobles, conscious of their former dignity, and thus showed up in twelfth-century Syria to marry a daughter to Kogh Vasil, but this is unlikely.

Armenians Amid Enemies? *Perceptions of Turks, Byzantines, and Franks*

Matthew's narratives and assessments of other peoples of the Levant, interspersed throughout his text, have been in large part what make him so interesting to modern historians. However, his depiction of non-Armenians was often contradictory, and historians have frequently assumed an anti-Byzantine or anti-Frankish bias without examining the depiction of such groups throughout Matthew's chronicle. The images of non-Armenians in all their complexity make sense only within his larger apocalyptic endeavor.

Matthew's stated purpose of explaining the disappearance of Armenian power at the hands of the Byzantines and Turks prepares the reader for a polemical account in which the Byzantines and the Turks oppress and persecute Armenian communities. Such an account would have established clear boundaries separating Armenians from their neighbors and insisted on a moral scheme of "good guys" and "bad guys," and in many cases, Matthew supplied just that. Mamlan, the Muslim emir of Azerbaijan, was "in his ferociousness like a bloodthirsty serpent . . . and spoke many blasphemous words to the heavens above."⁴⁶ Matthew likened the first appearance in Armenia of the Turks, "bloodthirsty beasts," to "winged serpents . . . intent on spreading like fire over all the lands of the Christian faithful."⁴⁷ An Armenian cleric in Matthew's account called them "accursed sons of Ham" and suggested that their closest ally was Satan.⁴⁸

Likewise the Byzantines, "the apostate and perfidious nation of heretics,"⁴⁹ appear as both political oppressors and religious persecutors.⁵⁰ Matthew blamed a massacre in the Holy Sepulcher on Byzantine theologians who used the wrong calendar to calculate Easter, sarcastically commenting that "this was the situation the intelligent sages of the Greeks brought about."⁵¹ He labeled the emperor Romanos III Argyros (1028–34) "a weak and timid person, besides being a very malicious and notorious blasphemer of the Orthodox faith."⁵² A Byzantine attack on Armenia was remembered as "bringing the sword and enslavement . . . killing savagely like a poisonous

⁴⁶ Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 34–35; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 37.

⁴⁷ Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 46; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 44.

⁴⁸ Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 72; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 59. For evil Turks, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 41–42; *Armenia*, 41; Turkish attack on Edessa, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*,

65; *Armenia*, 55; Turks as "venomous serpents," *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 146; *Armenia*, 102. For the connection between Satan and the Turks, see the discussion below on apocalypse.

⁴⁹ Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 96; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 72.

⁵⁰ For vicious Byzantines, Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 41;

Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 41; Byzantines plundering Christians, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 66; *Armenia*, 56. For attitudes toward crusaders and Franks, see below.

⁵¹ Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 43; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 42.

⁵² Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 57; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia* 51.

serpent, in this manner being no different from the infidel peoples.”⁵³ Emperor Constantine X Doukas (1059–67), supported by the Greek patriarch and the leading Byzantine aristocrats, sought to destroy the Armenian faith and “substitute his demonic, confused, and defective doctrine.”⁵⁴

Evil Turks and perfidious Byzantines find their complement in heroic Armenian leaders. Within the first few pages of his chronicle, for example, Matthew gave a dramatic account of a battle between the forces of Vasak Pahlavuni and the Muslim Daylamites of Azerbaijan. Matthew constructed his narrative with epic language: Vasak, with his beloved son Gregory and other illustrious noblemen, was making merry in his fortress of Bjni. Vasak saw a man coming in haste up the road on foot. Upon seeing him, Vasak said: “This man is a bearer of bad news.”⁵⁵ Indeed the man announced to the gathering that the whole district of Nig has been enslaved. “Roaring like a lion,” Vasak girded for battle with his troops, stopping first for communion and confession at a monastery on the way. They soon came to a village where the Muslims were massacring Christians gathered in a church, and killed three hundred of the invaders. Soon after, they confronted the main Muslim army, and Vasak engaged in single combat against “a dark Ethiopian” whom the Armenian eventually cleaved in two. Such an account delivers what the reader expects—noble Armenians going into battle against brave, though vicious Muslims, and triumphing through superior strength, virtue, and faith.⁵⁶

This pat dichotomy has been what historians have noticed most often in Matthew’s account, leading to the suggestion that Matthew was biased against non-Armenians. Such passages, however, are misleading. For every episode demonizing the Byzantines and Turks, the reader can find another praising them. Although Matthew specifically identified the Byzantines and Turks as the destroyers of the Armenians, he did not consistently portray either group as evil or opposed to Armenian interests. He praised Basil II, the emperor who arguably did the most to undermine Armenian independence,

53 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 41; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 41. The same accusation was leveled against the Byzantines in 1035/6 (Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 66; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia* 56).

54 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 159–60; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 109–10.

55 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 11; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 24.

56 Other such heroic scenes can be found in Matthew’s description of battle between King Ashot and a nameless Georgian prince: Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 9; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 23; Hasan and Chnchghuk avenging their father and brother: *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 91–92; *Armenia*, 69–70; see also the story of Liparit and Ch’ortuanel: *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 107–9; *Armenia*, 78–9; the death of Dawatanos: *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 142–3; *Armenia*, 100.

as “saintly” and as one who lived “a holy and chaste life . . . leaving behind a good memory.”⁵⁷ Matthew even documented Basil’s invasion of Armenia and annexation of Armenian kingdoms without criticism,⁵⁸ and instead offered his readers an unlikely story in which Basil received secret baptism at an Armenian monastery on the Black Mountain near Antioch and thus “became like an adopted father of the Armenian nation.”⁵⁹ The Turkish sultan Malik-Shah received an even more enthusiastic encomium upon death, remembered by Matthew as “father and parent to all, and a benevolent, merciful, and kind man towards all.”⁶⁰ The Turkish emir Malik-Ghazi Gümüshtegin Danishmend was even given Armenian ancestry in Matthew’s eulogy; at his death, he noted, “there was great sorrow among the Christian faithful who were under his rule.”⁶¹

Matthew’s attitude toward Frankish leaders was no less contradictory, and his depiction of Baldwin II, Count of Edessa (1100–1118) and later King of Jerusalem (1118–31), reveals the extent to which he could separate political actions and personal virtue, acts of betrayal and moral accountability. Portraying Baldwin’s rule of Edessa as particularly devastating for Armenian interests, a stab in the back after initial cooperation, Matthew documented a series of offenses perpetrated by the Frankish leader, including a massacre in Edessa in 1108/9, the temporary expulsion of the population of the city in 1113/4, connivance in the expulsion from Syria of Kogh Vasil’s heir, and, worst of all, the exile, torture, and murder of a number of prominent Armenian lords in 1117/8. Under Baldwin, Matthew insisted, “[the Franks] were continually occupied with such pursuits as these and did nothing but think up malicious and spiteful things; moreover, they had a love for perfidious and evil ways, having no regard for good and kindly actions.”⁶²

It is with some surprise, then, that we read, in the paragraph immediately following the one quoted above, Matthew’s appraisal of Baldwin II’s personal and moral qualities. He reminded his reader,

57 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 55; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 49–50. Nor does Matthew acknowledge that the Byzantine army that attacked Armenia in 991/2, denounced as “killing savagely like a poisonous serpent, in this manner being no different from the infidel peoples” was, even under his own chronology, necessarily under orders from Basil II (*Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 41; *Armenia*, 41). The anonymous continuator of T’ovma Artsruni likewise praised Basil as “a

father”; see T’ovmaj Vardapet Arcruni, *Patmut’iwn Tann Arcruniats’* (St. Petersburg, 1887), 307, translated by R. W. Thomson in Thomas Artsruni, *History of the House of the Artsrunik’* (Detroit, 1985), 370. For other Armenian attitudes toward Basil II, see J.-P. Mahé, “Basile II et Byzance vus par Grigor Narekac’i,” *TrM* 11 (1991): 555–73. For Matthew’s attitude toward other Byzantine emperors, see below.

58 However, Matthew did criticize King Hovhannes of Ani as “cowardly”

for giving in to the emperor’s demands (Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 49; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 46).

59 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 50; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 46.

60 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 243; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 158.

61 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 297; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 194.

62 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 339; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 221.

“Baldwin was one of the more illustrious members of the Frankish nobility; a valiant man and a warrior, exemplary in conduct, an enemy of sin, and by nature humble and modest.” Matthew did admit he had a bad side: “these good qualities were offset by ingenious avariciousness in seizing and accumulating the wealth of others and his insatiable love for money.” Yet he continues on to tell us that “he was very orthodox in his faith, and his ethical conduct and basic character were quite solid.”⁶³ Matthew’s contradictory statements of this nature make it difficult to use him as a barometer of Armenian attitudes toward other religious and ethnic groups, as historians have often done. Having abandoned a belief in Matthew’s hostility to non-Armenians, the reader may be tempted to suggest that Matthew was either wildly inconsistent or heavily edited. However, the chronicler’s apparent contradictions were not a result of inconsistency, but arose from his interest in tracing the portents of the coming Apocalypse as they appeared in the lives of individuals and communities. Baldwin’s actions were signs, not of Frankish character or the nature of their authority, but of the calamitous age in which he lived.

Betrayal

Matthew found the “good guy/bad guy” narratives, on which historians have largely focused, uninteresting for two reasons: they failed to explain divisions among Armenians, and placed emphasis on people, rather than on the acts of violence themselves, as the example of Baldwin II above suggests. The actions ascribed to the Armenian king of Lori, Davit’ Anhoghin (David the Landless, 989–1046/8), make clear that Matthew viewed Armenians as equally susceptible to contradictory acts of violence as Franks, Byzantines, and Turks. David’s first appearance in Matthew’s chronicle was as the Christian warrior and king par excellence. Attacked by the Kurdish emir of Dvin, Abu’l-Uswar, David rallied troops from neighboring kingdoms with the help of the Albanian *kat’olikos*, who announced that “if there be any man or woman desirous of a martyr’s death, lo, the opportunity has presented itself.” Like the forces of the First Crusade, David’s army was composed not only of armed soldiers, but also included unarmed men, women and children, bishops, monks, and deacons. Wielding the weapons of faith, “the whole camp took up the cross and the Gospels; the forces of the wicked approached, and the multitude of priests stood opposite them.”⁶⁴ The defeat of the invading Muslim army was total. As the leader of such an army, David would seem to exemplify the pious prince-hero, fitting into the “us-them” dichotomy historians often expect from medieval chroniclers. Yet one year later (and two pages farther on in the modern edition), Matthew described David as “an official of King Hovhannes of Ani”

63 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 340; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 221–22.

64 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 81–82; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 64.

who had rebelled against the king and “subjected many regions to the sword and enslavement.”⁶⁵ Furthermore Matthew accused David, “through [his] treachery and deceit,”⁶⁶ of encouraging the Byzantines to attack Ani, perhaps the greatest crime in Matthew’s eyes.

Betrayal, Matthew made clear, was no respecter of persons. Betraying or being betrayed did not indicate an individual’s sinful nature, but rather the state of the larger Armenian community. Even the progenitor of the Pahlavunis, Vasak, could not escape betrayal. Exhausted by his epic battle with the Ethiopian described above, Vasak fell asleep on a mountainside underneath the protection of an outcropping of rocks. There he was found by some local villagers, who struck him on the head, then threw his body from the high rocks; he was thus killed by the very people he had fought to protect. It is hardly the heroic end one would expect for a patriarch of a family Matthew repeatedly praised. Another ruler whom Matthew respected, the “saintly and righteous” *kouropalatēs* Davit’ of Tayk’, died at the hands of his own archbishop, Hilarion, who after first attempting to poison him with the Eucharistic chalice during Mass, finally resorted to smothering Davit’ in his sleep.⁶⁷ The deaths of Vasak and Davit’ occur in the first twenty pages of Matthew’s account; many others could be listed from elsewhere in the text.⁶⁸

The victim whose fate Matthew mourned most often was the kingdom and city of Ani. Its destruction and the exile of its kings was the most painful of the “horrible punishments” he described, and the betrayals associated with its fall were emblematic of what Armenians as a nation suffered.⁶⁹ Matthew considered the death of King Ashot IV of Ani (1021–39) a symbolic turning point in the fortunes of the

⁶⁵ Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 84–85; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 66. The switch from “king” to “official” is in part a reflection of Lori’s origin as a dependent province of the kingdom of Ani. Lori was given to David’s father Gurgen as something like an appanage. The kings of Ani were reluctant to accept Lori as fully independent.

⁶⁶ Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 88; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 68.

⁶⁷ Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 37–38; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 39. Matthew’s willingness to adapt historical events to his own purpose is again evident here. Matthew suggests that Basil II, one of his heroes, avenged David’s death, when in fact he seized David’s lands after his death as punishment for David’s participation in the revolt against him by Bardas Phokas; see Whittow,

Byzantium, 384. Aristakes Lastivertts’i believed that the poisoned Eucharistic chalice was the cause of David’s death, but did not hold the archbishop responsible. Instead he blamed a group of noblemen of Tayk’ (Aristakes Lastivertts’i, *Patmut’iwn*, 10).

⁶⁸ For the anonymous *vestis* betrayed by the *doux* of Antioch to the Turks so that the *vestis* might not win fame and glory, see *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 157–58; *Armenia*, 108; on Liparit, whom the Byzantine army abandoned on the battlefield “so that he would not gain the reputation of being valiant,” see *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 107–9; *Armenia*, 79; on the four sons of Abel, besieged by the Byzantines (motivated by “venomous slanders”), one killed in his sleep by “comrades and old friends,” the other three imprisoned, see *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 109–12; *Armenia*,

80–81. Significantly this episode is the last in the first section of Matthew’s chronicle. Other such episodes include Sharaf-al-Daulah, emir of Mosul, “a kind man and benevolent towards the Christian faithful,” who was killed by his own troops (*Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 227–8; *Armenia*, 149); Malik-Shah, “a benevolent, merciful and kind man,” who was poisoned by his wife (*Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 243; *Armenia*, 158); the *kouropalatēs* T’oros killed by Edessans after they swore an oath to protect him (*Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 261–62; *Armenia*, 169–70).

⁶⁹ Again his interest in Ani may reflect the patronage of the Pahlavunis, whose lands were a part of the Bagratuni kingdom of Ani, or perhaps point to Matthew’s own origins.

Armenians. After this, “the Armenian forces grew slack and scorned the art of war. They became subject to the Roman yoke, they reveled in drunkenness. . . . They departed from unity with one another and they no longer came to one another’s aid. They shed tears for the land which was being put to the sword, weeping together for its destruction and at the same time delivering up one another to the sword of the Greek nation.”⁷⁰

Betrayal rarely benefited the traitor; it served only to place Armenians under “the Roman yoke.” Moral decline within the Armenian world was thus the complement of the assaults of Turks and Byzantines from without. However, betrayal within Armenian ranks preceded the onslaught of the Turks and the annexations of the Byzantines; the conquest of Armenia was thus a symptom, not a cause, of Armenian decline.

Betrayal and conflict dogged Ashot’s son and successor Gagik II (1042–45) at every turn. Matthew’s account of the loss of his kingdom is confused, perhaps a symptom of his chronological and geographical distance from the events he was trying to explain.⁷¹ Matthew largely blamed an Armenian nobleman by the name of Sargis, who attempted to seize the kingdom for himself in 1041/2 following the death of Gagik’s uncle Hovhannes.⁷² When that proved unsuccessful, Sargis instigated Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos’s ultimately successful attack on Gagik and Ani two years later.⁷³ At Sargis’s suggestion, the emperor invited Gagik to visit him in Constantinople. While the king was absent, Sargis and his supporters handed Ani over to the Byzantines, in the face of the opposition of the general populace, who “wept for their royal throne and, deeply lamenting, wept for their king Gagik.”⁷⁴ Strikingly, the weeping Armenians cursed those who betrayed Gagik—Sargis and his supporters—but not the Byzantines

70 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 79; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 63.

71 King Hovhannes-Smbat III of Ani, Gagik’s uncle, had promised his kingdom to the Byzantines after his death; according to Matthew, this was forestalled by a group of aristocrats led by Vahram Pahlavuni; see Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 85–86; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 66.

72 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 84; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 66. Yet Sargis was listed as one of the “eminent” men, along with Gregory Magistros (one of the Pahlavunis), sent to Hovhannes Kozern to hear his grim vision (Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 67; Matthew of Edessa,

Armenia, 56). Matthew either did not know, or chose not to mention, the fact that Sargis was Gregory Magistros’s son-in-law; see genealogical chart in Leroy, “Grégoire Magistros.”

73 The royal heirs of Vaspurakan later fell victim to a similar betrayal. “A certain wicked and evil prince from the noblemen of Senek’erim went to the Greek emperor and severely denounced Atom and Abusahl, the sons of Senek’erim, saying: ‘They are intent on rebelling against you and thus causing you annoyance and trouble.’ The emperor Michael [IV the Paphlagonian], having heard this, believed these falsely spoken words. . . .” They saved themselves only by

throwing themselves on the tomb of Emperor Basil II, whom Matthew claimed as “an adopted father of the Armenian nation”; see Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 83–84; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 65.

74 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 96–97; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 72–73. Aristakes also detailed Sargis’s attempt to gain the throne in the wake of Hovhannes’s death, as well as Vahram Pahlavuni’s opposition to him (Aristakes, *Patmut’iwn*, 47–48). Aristakes, however, blamed Gagik for pardoning Sargis for his treason, and then for compounding his error by listening to his advice to go to Constantinople, ignoring Vahram’s counsel to the contrary (Aristakes, *Patmut’iwn*, 51).

into whose hands he was betrayed. The true threat was that of betrayal from within, not from Byzantine aggression or trickery.

As with the violence of the Turks, Franks, and Byzantines, Matthew was more interested in the act of betrayal than in the moral qualities of the betrayed, and frequently minimized the culpability of the betrayer by recounting their repentance or restitution. An early example is the Armenian general Aplgharip who, bitter over his replacement, betrayed his king, Derenik-Ashot of Vaspurakan (936/7–953), to an infidel army, which resulted not only in the king's capture but also in the slaughter of an Armenian army. Matthew, however, still considered the general "mighty and brave," even though excommunicated by the Armenian monks of Varag, and described his rescue of the king he betrayed.⁷⁵ When King Hovhannes-Smbat III of Ani (1020–40, Gagik's uncle) wrongly imprisoned the *kat'olikos* Petros in 1037/8, he installed the "eminent orator" and abbot Deoskoros (Dioscorus) as the new patriarch. Matthew adopted a mournful tone when discussing Dioscorus's subsequent excommunication and loss of reputation, although the abbot was clearly complicit in Petros's supersession and had "ordained unworthy people to the episcopate." After Petros was restored to his throne, Matthew mildly noted that "Dioscorus went back to Sanahin, his monastery, very much ashamed of what he had done."⁷⁶ Matthew later included Dioscorus in his list of "eminent Armenian vardapets," signaling that his character was unbesmirched by his act of betrayal.⁷⁷

Nor were Armenians the only victims of betrayal from within. Matthew had a particular concern for Byzantine emperors, who suffered as much as did Armenian leaders from untrustworthy subordinates and family members, and were given frequent opportunities by Matthew to redeem themselves from the sin of betrayal. He recounted how John Tzimiskes "ruthlessly and savagely butchered the very benevolent" emperor Nikephoras II Phokas, praised as "filled with every virtue and upright quality."⁷⁸ Matthew believed that John later

75 Matthew misdated this event, mistakenly placing it in 965/6, more than twenty years after the king's death (Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 30–31; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 35–36). See also the story of Apirat, who rebelled against King Hovhannes of Ani and fled to Abu'l-Uswar, Kurdish emir of Dvin. Abu'l-Uswar, "vengeful in his heart," executed Apirat, a "brave man, one mighty and renowned in all of Armenia" (*Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 10–11;

Armenia, 24). Apirat married into the Pahlavuni family and was the grandfather of the *kat'olikos* Barsegh Pahlavuni (*Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 211; *Armenia*, 140).

76 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 77–78; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 62. Matthew uses an Armenian phrase (*kari jozh*), combining two words, which both mean "very much." Together as a phrase they emphasized the strength of Dioscorus's shame, meaning "supremely, to the utmost."

77 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 179; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 121.

78 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 6–7; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 21–22. His murder of Phokas also led to the defeat of the Byzantine army at Amida, for God turned against them and gave victory to the Muslims (*Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 14–16; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 26–27).

repented and joined a monastery,⁷⁹ though in fact he died while still emperor. Isaac I Komnenos (1057–59) was not liked “because he committed various perfidious acts against the Christians” and because he had “an evil nature”;⁸⁰ yet when God annihilated the Byzantine army while it was marching to battle with the Pechenegs, Isaac “realized that all this divine-rebuking wrath had fallen upon the Christians because of his iniquities, for by his sins he had angered God.” After seeking forgiveness, “he sought to leave the imperial throne and with fasting and weeping take up the life of a penitent.”⁸¹ Even though Romanos IV Diogenes (1068–71) had sworn to exterminate the Armenian faith and had been cursed by Armenian monks, Matthew still disapproved of the “perfidious Romans” who secretly negotiated to betray him to Alp Arslan before the battle of Mantzikert,⁸² and compared the blinding and subsequent death of Romanos to the crucifixion of Jesus by the Jews.⁸³ The emperor Nikephoros III Botaniates (1078–81) left the throne after a year; his conscience bothered him, having seized power from Michael VII Doukas (1071–78), who “was benevolent and pious and endowed with all sorts of virtues and radiant holiness.” Both Botaniates and Doukas became monks.⁸⁴ If Matthew had written the *Inferno*, betrayers would be at worst somewhere in Limbo, not stuck in Satan’s mouth at the last circle of Hell.

79 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 29–30; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 34.

80 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 125; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 90.

81 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 126; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 91.

82 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 200; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 133–4.

83 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 203; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 135.

84 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 215; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 142.

Apocalypse

The attacks on Artsn, Melitene, Sebasteia, and Ani, as well as the betrayal Matthew saw as endemic in Armenian and Byzantine society, were the result of a single cosmic event foretold by Scripture—the release of Satan from the thousand-year imprisonment in which Christ’s death and resurrection had placed him.⁸⁵ Nor was the vision of John in the *Book of Revelation* the only warning God gave humanity, for a series of apocalyptic visions were woven through Matthew’s chronicle, forming in a sense a table of contents and foreshadowing events that often appeared only a dozen pages later. The two visions of the hermit and vardapet Hovhannes Kozern⁸⁶ were the first and most detailed descriptions Matthew gave his readers. The first vision came in the year 1022/3, when on the third of October the trifecta of apocalyptic signs appeared on the same day—earthquake, eclipse, and blinding celestial light. When Armenian princes sought the meaning of these dire cosmic signs, Hovhannes told them the portents signaled that Satan had been released from his thousand-year imprisonment. Armenians would soon feel Satan’s presence both in the degradation of social and religious bonds within their communities, and in the devastation of the “ferocious and savage nation of the Turks.” Monks will abandon their monasteries, priests their churches, and family members will turn against each other, while Armenian cities and kingdom will fall to Turkish attack.⁸⁷ The hermit’s

85 Rev 20:1–11. A large bibliography exists covering apocalypticism and millenarianism. On specific responses to the book of Revelation, see *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. R. K. Emmerson and B. McGinn (Ithaca, N.Y., 1992); *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*, ed. W. Verbeke, D. Verhelst, and A. Welkenhuysen (Leuven, 1988); *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectations and Social Change, 950–1050*, ed. R. Landes, A. Gow, and D. C. Van Meter (Oxford, 2003); *Last Things: Death and the Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. C. Walker Bynum and P. Freedman (Philadelphia, 2000). Apocalyptic elements have a long history in Armenian historiography; see R. W. Thomson, “The Writing of History: The Development of the Armenian and Georgian Traditions,” in *Il Caucaso: Cerniero fra culture dal Mediterraneo alla Persia (secoli IV–XI): 20–26 aprile 1995* (Spoleto, 1996), 493–514. The fifth-century historian named Agat’angeghos recorded a vision of St. Gregory the Illuminator, which revealed the

divisions that would soon beset Armenian society (Agat’angeghos, *History of the Armenians*, trans. R. W. Thomson [Albany, N.Y., 1976], 273–97). See also Lewond, *History of Lewond the Eminent Vardapet of the Armenians*, trans. Zaven Arzoumanian (Wynnewood, Pa., 1982), 131–32; and the two apocalypses at the end of Andrew Palmer’s *The Seventh Century in the West Syrian Chronicles* (Liverpool, 1993), 222–59, as well as A. Hultgård, “The Vision of Enoch the Just and Medieval Apocalypses,” in *Apocryphes arméniens: Transmission, traduction, création, iconographie, actes du colloque international sur la littérature apocryphe en langue arménienne, Genève, 18–20 septembre 1997*, ed. V. Calzolari Bouvier, J.-D. Kaestli, and B. Outtier (Lausanne, 1999), 147–58. The text is translated in J. Issaverdens, *The Uncanonical Writings of the Old Testament Found in the Armenian Mss. of the Library of St. Lazarus* (Venice, 1901), 306–23. See also R. W. Thomson, “Biblical Themes in the Armenian Historian Sebeos,” in *After Bardaisan:*

Studies in Continuity and Change in Syriac Christianity in Honor of Professor Han J. W. Drijvers, ed. G. J. Reinink and A. C. Klugkist (Leuven, 1999), 295–302. Thomson briefly addresses this theme in Matthew of Edessa: “‘History’ in Medieval Armenian Historians,” in *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium: Papers from the Thirty-third Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, ed. A. Eastmond (Aldershot, 2001), 89–99, as well as in “Crusades through Armenian Eyes,” 74–75.

86 Hovhannes also appeared in the eleventh-century account of Aristakes Lastivertts’i, where he is noted as an author of a book on faith (Aristakes, *Patmut’iwn*, 13).

87 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 52–55; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 47–49. For similar Byzantine concerns around the same time, see P. Magdalino, “The History of the Future and Its Uses: Prophecy, Policy and Propaganda,” in *The Making of Byzantine History*, ed. R. Beaton and C. Roueché (Aldershot, 1993), 3–34; Magdalino, “The Year 1000 in Byzantium,” in *Byzantium in the Year 1000*, ed. P. Magdalino (Leiden, 2003), 233–70.

vision thus predicted the betrayals within Armenian society and the “horrible punishments” Armenians suffered at the hands of other peoples that were Matthew’s principal theme. While elsewhere Matthew explicitly blamed the Byzantines and the Turks for Armenia’s decline, Hovhannes’s revelation made Satan the puppet-master who was responsible for the violence and betrayal endemic in Matthew’s world.

In 1036/7 another earthquake and eclipse again struck fear into the hearts of the Armenians, and Matthew had the hermit reiterate his former predictions in greater detail.⁸⁸ Again Hovhannes emphasized Satan’s release and his close association with the Turks, as well as the moral decline that would undermine the social bonds at the heart of Armenian society. His second prediction, however, added a new hopeful element to his previous grim prophecy. After sixty years, “the valiant nation called the Franks will rise up; with a great number of troops they will capture the holy city of Jerusalem, and the Holy Sepulcher, which contained God, will be freed from bondage.”⁸⁹

Yet the crusaders were only the harbingers of Christian renewal, for their arrival would be followed by a forty-year period featuring suffering seven times worse than that which accompanied the initial Turkish invasion. True salvation would come only when “the Roman Emperor will be awakened as if from a sleep, and like an eagle, rapidly will come against the Turks with a very great army, as numerous as the sands of the seashore. He will march forth like a burning fire, and all creatures will tremble in fear of him.”⁹⁰ The emperor’s triumph over the Muslims will be complete, and the way made clear for the second coming of Christ, though Matthew never directly discussed the final days and the Last Judgment.

Hovhannes’s predictions were not the only ones Matthew recorded. He noted that the division of the Armenian patriarchate among six rival *kat’olikoi* in the 1080s had been predicted by Saint Sahak, one of the earliest Armenian patriarchs.⁹¹ The First Crusade, “the coming of the Westerners,” was, according to Matthew, foreseen by Saint Nerses, another early *kat’olikos*. When the crusaders

88 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 68, 71; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 57, 58. Hovhannes made reference to the signs of fourteen years earlier; this is mistranslated as “forty” by Dostourian.

89 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 66–74; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 56–60. For more on Franks as apocalyptic signs, see Thomson, “Crusades through Armenian Eyes,” 74–75.

90 Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 73; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 60.

91 Matthew reminds the reader that Hovhannes Kozern also predicted this (Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 230; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 151). See also N. Garsoïan, “Reality and Myth in Armenian History,” in *The East and the Meaning of History: International Conference (23–27 November 1992)* (Rome, 1994), 137–42.

captured Jerusalem, Matthew assured his reader that this, too, was predicted by Nerses, adding “but because of their sins the city once again will fall into the hands of the infidels.”⁹² Matthew even had a Syrian hermit named Mark reiterate Hovhannes’s predictions a few years after the First Crusade, lest his reader forget their importance.⁹³

Alongside apocalyptic visions (and sometimes accompanying them, as we have seen with Hovhannes Kozern), Matthew noted cataclysmic events such as comets, earthquakes, and eclipses occurring on a regular basis, explicit reminders of the final disaster to come.⁹⁴ A star that appeared in 1003/4, accompanied by an earthquake and a plague, was “an omen of the wrath [*barkut’iwn*] of God towards all living creatures and also a sign of the end of the world.”⁹⁵ Fire from heaven destroyed the church of St. Peter in Antioch (a punishment intended to recall that of Sodom, for Matthew alleged that Antioch participated in the same sin), and an earthquake there swallowed ten thousand Christians.⁹⁶ In 1058/9 poisonous red snow fell for sixty days on northern Syria, killing man and beast, “a horrible sign of [God’s] great wrath [*barkut’iwn*].”⁹⁷ Comets appeared in 1066/7, 1070/1, and 1097/8, and Matthew explicitly linked them to God’s anger, Christian sin, Turkish attack, or imminent apocalypse.⁹⁸ The arrival of the crusaders was heralded by no less than four celestial events.

Predictions and visions were more than simply warnings to Armenian communities; they served to highlight events of particular significance to Matthew. He exhorted his reader to remember the grim events of the past, declaring the purpose of his chronicle to be that “these persons shall learn about the terrible misfortunes which occurred in those times and, once again bringing these things to mind, shall remember the divine wrath [*barkut’iwn*] which we

⁹² Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 267; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 172. See also Thomson, “Crusades through Armenian Eyes,” 71–82.

⁹³ Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 300–301; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 196.

⁹⁴ The very first incident Matthew described in his chronicle was a famine and plague of locusts around Edessa and Mesopotamia, though he did not explicitly designate this a sign as he did other such events (Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 1; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 19).

⁹⁵ Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 45–46; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 43.

⁹⁶ It was also punishment for the incineration of a Syrian Orthodox [Jacobite] Bible, burnt by the Byzantine patriarch and his priests (Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 115–17; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 85–86). Other earthquakes are cited in 1090/1 (*Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 241; *Armenia*, 157) and in 1114/5, again citing God’s *barkut’iwn* (*Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 331; *Armenia*, 216).

⁹⁷ This was the same year as the sack of Melitene (Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 131; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 93); another plague occurred in 1003/4 (*Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 45–46; *Armenia*, 43).

⁹⁸ Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 78 (death of Ashot IV Bagratuni), 185 (preceding the attacks of the Turk Afshin), 193 (accompanying the attacks of Alp Arslan), 260 (in conjunction with the First Crusade), 304 (at the same time as the Armenian revolt in Aplast’an), 316 (massacre of the citizens of Edessa); Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 62, 124, 129, 168, 198, 206. Such signs also impacted Muslim communities: fire from heaven destroyed a mosque in Amida in 1115/6 (*Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 334–35; *Armenia*, 218); and a similar event in Baghdad in 1121/2, again an expression of God’s *barkut’iwn* (*Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 350–51; *Armenia*, 228).

received from God, the righteous judge, as a penalty for our sins.” Most importantly, however, the chronicler insisted on connecting the suffering of Armenians in the past to that of his own community. “Once again we find ourselves inflicted with the same chastisement for our sins, a chastisement which we received for that which we justly deserve.”⁹⁹

Matthew clearly feared that Armenians would fail to recognize the prophecies of their patriarchs and hermits unfolding around them. Indeed he provided examples of such improvident Armenians, such as those seized in 1062/3 by a Turkish group, who asked their captives,

“Why did you become enslaved, [allowing yourself] to be in such an unprepared state, and why were you unable to have foresight, either by ear or through a sign, so that you might have fled from us?” The [Armenian] captives answered: “We were unable to realize anything.” Then the infidel woman said: “Lo, this was the sign of your destruction; when in the evening your cock crowed and your cattle and sheep squatted to defecate, this was the sign for the calamity.” The captives answered: “All that had happened to us many times in our country, but we were never able to realize that it was a sign for us of the calamity (*barkut’iwn*).”¹⁰⁰

Yet not all Armenians were ignorant of the coming calamity. King Senek’erim-Hovhannes of Vaspurakan (1003–21) had better instincts than did the confused captives. After the first battle in which he encountered Turkish forces, “[he] examined the chronicles and utterances of the divinely-inspired prophets, the holy vardapets, and found written in these books the time specified for the coming of the forces and soldiers of the Turks. He also learned of the impending destruction and end of the whole world. . . .”¹⁰¹ Senerk’erim decided to exchange his kingdom for territories within the Byzantine Empire, hoping that he would be safer there.

Matthew’s apocalyptic concerns emerge not only through recitation of prophecies, accounts of disastrous weather, earthquakes, and Turkish attacks, but also, perhaps most importantly, in the decline of faith and morality among Christians, particularly Armenians. When the Armenian community of Aplast’an (modern Elbistan in Anatolia)

⁹⁹ Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 113–14; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 83–84.

¹⁰⁰ Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 141; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 99.

¹⁰¹ Matt’eos Urhayets’i, *Zhamanakagrut’iwn*, 48; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 45. Matthew (or Senek’erim) was mistaken; they were more likely raiders from Azerbaijan; see A. E. Redgate, *The Armenians* (Oxford, 1998), 226.

tired of Frankish oppression, they invited Turkish soldiers to occupy their town, a decision that led to a battle and subsequent massacre of the entire Frankish garrison by the local population. Yet Matthew turned his interest away from the explicit violence of the story and focused on the more subtle social and moral effects Satan's presence had engendered. Through Frankish oppression Satan had not only alienated the Armenians and provoked a massacre but, in Matthew's description, had poisoned the land itself. "Because of the Franks, the land became barren. The vineyards and orchards withered, the fields became covered in thistles, and the springs dried up. Friendship and happiness between friends was destroyed."¹⁰² Just as Hovhannes predicted, people abandoned the church and hatred spread everywhere. Yet this episode was not a sign of inherent Frankish evil, of little interest to Matthew, but a sign of the state of the world. The Franks were victims, too, just as Adam had been a victim of Satan's wiles in the garden of Eden. The consequences of sin at the beginning and end of time extended to the fertility of the earth itself; in Aplast'an and in Eden, thistles grew in what were once fertile fields.¹⁰³

Peace and Its Dangers

The prophecy of Hovhannes Kozern was a template Matthew intended as a guide to the recent past and present. The period of Matthew's own life corresponded to the period of Turkish oppression "seven times worse" that followed the conquest of Jerusalem by the "valiant nation of the Franks." Matthew reminded his readers that "since the day the Frankish nation went forth, not one good or favorable omen appeared; on the contrary, all the omens pointed to the calamity, destruction, ruin, and disruption of the land through death, slaughter, famine, and other catastrophes."¹⁰⁴ All that remained to complete Kozern's prophecy was the appearance of the last Roman emperor, which, according to the hermit's timetable, should have happened around 1148.¹⁰⁵ Again this can be tied to events contemporary with Matthew. The expansion of Byzantine power under the Komnenian emperors matched Kozern's predictions of imperial triumph, and by the time Matthew was finishing his chronicle in the 1130s, John Komnenos had intimidated the Franks, Armenians, and Turks in northern Syria into acknowledging his power. Clearly his complete triumph was not far off.

¹⁰² Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 302–4; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 197–98.

¹⁰³ Gen. 3:18.

¹⁰⁴ Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 270; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 175.

¹⁰⁵ For Byzantine attitudes toward the last emperor at this time, see Magdalino, "History of the Future," 26–27.

Yet other aspects of Hovhannes' vision were more difficult to discern. Even Matthew had a hard time finding episodes of political or military oppression affecting Armenians occurring in the 1120s and 30s that matched the drama of the initial Turkish attacks on Armenian cities such as Ani and Artsn in the eleventh century. In 1124/5 he even recorded that Ani had been liberated from the yoke of Muslim rule by "the saintly and virtuous king" David, ruler of the Georgians; in response to the city's liberation, "there was rejoicing throughout all Armenia."¹⁰⁶ This hardly seems seven times worse than the sack of the city some sixty years before. Instead Matthew perceived the hermit's prophecy fulfilled, as at Aplast'an, in the disintegration of the social and moral bonds of society, equally a sign of satanic influence. Just as Armenian betrayal had preceded Turkish sieges, Matthew, as the world's end drew near, sought Satan in the sapping of the natural bonds of family, religion, and community, rather than in the savagery of Turkish raids.

Matthew was not entirely wrong in perceiving a world in which ethnic and religious boundaries were crumbling, particularly for diasporic Armenians. Armenian generals and aristocrats moved easily among Byzantines, Turks, and Franks, with little sense of political betrayal or cultural loss, a fluidity characteristic of the eleventh- and twelfth-century Middle East. Particularly prone to such peripateticism were the new military elites spawned by Byzantine and Armenian expansion in the tenth century. The Armenian nobleman Aplasat', for example, left the service of Kogh Vasil after a dispute and, instead of joining the forces of another Armenian lord, attached himself for a time to Baldwin II of Edessa.¹⁰⁷ Even Matthew's heroes, the Pahlavunis, showed little regard for such boundaries. Matthew depicted them as Armenian patriots, yet the Pahlavunis had little compunction in taking up employment with their former opponents, the Byzantines. Although the *sparapet* Vahram had defended Ani from Byzantine attack,¹⁰⁸ he died a few years later serving in the imperial army.¹⁰⁹ His nephew Gregory Magistros and Gregory's sons accepted military positions and political honors from the emperor. *Kat'olikos* Gregory II wandered from Ani to Rome, as well as visiting Fatimid Egypt, where he named his nephew Gregory *kat'olikos* for the large Armenian community established there by a series of Armenian viziers who ruled Fatimid Egypt from 1073 to 1121.¹¹⁰

106 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 359; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 233.

107 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 310–11; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 202–3.

108 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 85–86; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 66–67.

109 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 98; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 73–4.

110 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 211; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 140. See also Kapoian-Kouymjian, *L'Égypte vue par des Arméniens*, 7–93.

Although Armenia sat on the outer limits of the Mediterranean and Near Eastern worlds geographically, conquest by Byzantines and Muslims had led to the establishment of Armenian communities far abroad in Constantinople, Edessa, and Alexandria, as well as in places such as Sicily and Bulgaria. For many Armenians, these places were no more foreign than Ani and Kars. Matthew's chronicle was an argument to remind Armenians that this larger world was a dangerous one in which Armenians should never feel too comfortable.

The experience of other Christian minorities in the Islamic world was similar. The memoirs of a Nestorian Christian doctor named Ibn Butlan, living in the middle to late eleventh century, detailed his life as a peripatetic doctor, practicing his craft at various times in Aleppo and Cairo as well as Antioch and Constantinople. Yet his account showed more concern with the professional jealousy of rival doctors than with the seemingly disparate political, religious, and ethnic realms through which he traveled.¹¹¹ That is, professional identities—doctor, soldier—often were as important as, and at times more important than, ethnicity or religion. In the eyes of Matthew, this cultural fluidity was not a good thing, but a sign of the Satan-induced crumbling of natural social bonds. His chronicle was a reminder to Armenians of the violence they had suffered in the past; he clearly feared that they were blind to its contemporary significance and therefore frequently urged his readers to remember the omens, predictions, and evidence of God's anger.¹¹² The peacefulness and integration of Matthew's own day was thus the greatest threat, for it was the most insidious expression of Satan's power.

For Matthew the problem tolerance presented was not its absence, but its confusing, ambiguous, and anomalous presence. While stories of violence and massacre appealed to Frankish and Muslim chroniclers because they clearly delineated separation among communities, for Matthew violence was not the opposite of tolerance, but phenomenologically the same thing—the social manifestation of Satan's power in the world. With this view, Matthew's understanding of the Last Days makes more sense. He had little interest in the final event itself. He never mentioned the return of Jesus Christ or the Last Judgment, and his account of the time leading up to the Apocalypse depended entirely on widely held beliefs about the figure of the Last Emperor, whom Matthew was content to identify as a Byzantine, despite his devotion to Armenian kingship. Matthew did not seek to prepare Armenians for the end of the world, but to open their eyes to the erosion of their culture and community by the military, political, and cultural power of the Byzantines, Turks, and Franks.

111 Lawrence Conrad, "Ibn Butlan in *Bilad al-Sham*: The Career of a Traveling Christian Physician," in *Syrian Christians under Islam: The First Thousand Years* (Leiden, 2001), 131–58.

112 Matt'eos Urhayets'i, *Zhamanakagrut'iwn*, 274; Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia*, 177.

—Dartmouth College

THE POSTCOLONIAL MIDDLE AGES

Edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen

palgrave



This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes.

THE POSTCOLONIAL MIDDLE AGES

Copyright © Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, 2000. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles or reviews.

First published in hardcover in 2000 by St. Martin's Press

First PALGRAVE™ edition: April 2001

175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010 and

Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, England RG21 6XS

Companies and representatives throughout the world.

PALGRAVE is the new global publishing imprint of St. Martin's Press
LLC

Scholarly and Reference Division and Palgrave Publishers Ltd (formerly
Macmillan Press Ltd).

ISBN 0-312-21929-6 hardcover

ISBN 0-312-23981-5 paperback

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The postcolonial Middle Ages / edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen.

p. cm. (New Middle Ages)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-312-23981-5

1. Middle Ages—History. 2. Colonies. I. Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome.

D113.5.P65 2000

909.07 21—dc21

99-044203

CIP

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Design by Letra Libre, Inc.

First paperback edition: May 2001

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America

CHAPTER 4

CILICIAN ARMENIAN MÉTISSAGE AND HETOUM'S *LA FLEUR DES HISTOIRES* *DE LA TERRE D'ORIENT*

Glenn Burger

The generic discontinuities and unexpected conjunctions of La Fleur des histoires bear witness to the complexities of its author's cultural location as part of a Cilician Armenian diasporic community. The text demonstrates an innovative cross-cultural negotiation in advance of modern European colonialism and in excess of medieval European attempts at cultural hegemony.

Although little known today, *La Fleur des histoires de la terre d'Orient*, written by the Cilician Armenian prince Hetoum of Korikos, was a popular text throughout the late medieval and early modern period. Fifteen manuscript copies of the original French text and thirty-one copies of the scribal Latin translation survive.¹ The Latin text was later translated back into French: anonymously in British Library MS Cotton Otho.D.V, and then in 1351 by the monk Jean le Long, as part of a collection of Eastern travel literature and works relating to the Mongols.² Hetoum's work enjoyed a similar popularity with the early European printers. There were three undated, early sixteenth-century printings of the original French text, under the title *Sensuyrent les fleurs des histoires de la terre Dorient*: first in Paris by Philippe Le Noir, second in Paris by Denys Janot after Le Noir, and third in Lyon, also after Le Noir, for Benoist Rigaud. These editions show that Hetoum's text was considered more than a historical

curiosity, for Le Noir attempts to bring the book up to date by replacing the original Book IV and its plan to reconquer the Holy Land with a new book entitled “des Sarrazins e des Turcz depuis le premier iusques aux presens q’ont conqueste Rhodes Hongrye et dernièrement assailli Austriche” [A history from the beginning to the present of the Turks who had conquered Rhodes, Hungary, and lately besieged Austria]. Also, in 1529, Le Long’s French translation of the Latin text was published under the title *L’Hystoire merueilleuse plaisante et recreative du grand Empereur de Tartarie*. Editions of the Latin text were published six times throughout the sixteenth century.³

Even this brief outline of the publication history of *La Fleur des histoires* should make evident the extent to which its early readers viewed the text within the normalizing frames of European crusade propaganda or exotic travel narrative. Similarly Eurocentric tendencies mark the work’s reception by modern audiences, but now work to maintain the text’s obscurity on the margins of Western histories of the Crusades or European travel literature. Indeed, the scribal colophon ending *La Fleur des histoires* already provides such a hermeneutics of incorporation and colonization. Its inscription of the desires of its first European “readers”—Nicholas Falcon, Hetoum’s scribe, and Pope Clement V, the supposed commissioner of the Latin translation—assimilates the potentially disorienting discontinuities and differences of Hetoum’s text within an already known Western *Christianitas*:

Here endeth the boke of Thistoris of Thorient Partes (compyled by a relygious man, Frere Hayton, frere of Premonstre order, somtyme lorde of Corc, and cosyn german to the Kyng of Armeny) vpon the passage of the Holy Land, by the commaundement of the Holy Fader the Apostle of Rome, Clement the V, in the cite of Potiers. Which boke, I, Nicholas Falcon, writ first in French as the Frere Hayton sayd with his mouth without any note or example; and out of Frenche I haue translated it in Latyn for our Holy Father the Pope, in the yere of Our Lorde God M CCC vii in the moneth of August. (G3v, p. 85)⁴

Falcon’s account emphasizes both the text’s translatability and Hetoum’s serviceable position as native informant—this “relygious man” speaking French, intent “vpon the passage of the Holy Land,” and working upon “the commaundment of the Holy Fader.” In the process, this incorporation of Hetoum and his text within the European imaginary and its colonizing fantasies of the Middle and Far East flattens the text’s diasporic and poly-cultural Cilician Armenian perspective. Hetoum’s Western readers thus can ignore the potentially awkward differences generated by the complex rela-

tionships of Western ecclesiastical and secular desire vis-à-vis the crusade—differences within and between European and Middle Eastern Christian allies,⁵ Western and Eastern cultures, Christian and non-Christian.⁶

Certainly the fiction that *La Fleur des histoires* was simply compiled by a “Frere Hayton” writing under papal commandment provides a useful disguise to cover the potentially awkward relationship of the book and its author to contemporary Cypriot and Armenian politics. For if Hetoum did indeed choose to retire to the monastic life in Cyprus, he did so for only a very brief period. Before 1305, as *La Fleur des histoires* makes clear, Hetoum actively participated in the succession of military campaigns necessary to the security of the increasingly beleaguered Cilician Armenian kingdom.⁷ Given his close family connection to the royal house of Cilician Armenia and the successful careers of his children, one can presume that Hetoum played an important and dynamic role in the political life of the kingdom.⁸ If so, he could not have cut himself off from the dynastic struggles dividing Cilician Armenia between 1295 and 1305, nor could he have failed to align himself with one or more of the feuding parties.

But the exact nature of his role is unclear and has been much disputed. The dates coincide with a period of civil war in Cilician Armenia between King Hetoum II and some of his brothers. In 1295–96 Hetoum II and his brother Toros were in Constantinople arranging the marriage of their sister Rita to Michael, son of the Byzantine emperor. During their absence their brother Sempad seized power, possibly with the support of the catholicos Gregory VII and Pope Boniface VIII. Hetoum II and Toros were arrested and imprisoned by Sempad after an unsuccessful visit to the court of Ghazan, Mongol ilkhan of Persia (and overlord and ally of Cilician Armenia), having been thwarted by a previous mission of Sempad. While in prison, Sempad had Toros strangled and Hetoum blinded. However, two years later, in 1298, another brother, Constantine, deposed Sempad, only to be ousted in turn by King Hetoum II, who had by then partially recovered his sight. Both Sempad and Constantine were exiled to Constantinople under the care of their sister Rita, now wife of Emperor Michael IX. These conflicts were finally resolved in 1305 by the recognition of the son of Toros as King Leon III and his uncle, Hetoum II, as regent. Unfortunately, the young king's reign was short-lived, for on December 7, 1307, both Hetoum II and Leon III were assassinated by the Mongol general Bilarghu. After a brief attempt by Constantine to seize power, Oshin, another brother of Hetoum II, ascended the throne.

According to the testimony of *La Fleur des histoires*, Hetoum of Korikos played a central role in restoring some measure of internal and external calm to Armenia during these years. At the end of Book Three, speaking

of a victory of the Armenians and Mongol over the Egyptian forces invading Cilicia, Hetoum adds:

And I, Frere Hayton, maker of this warke, was present to this thinges. And longe tyme afore that I was purposed to take the order of relygion, but I coude nat, for the great besinesse that the Kyng of Armeny had at that tyme; I coude nat, for myne honour, forsake my lordes and my frendes in all nedis. But sith God of his grace hath gyuen vs the victory agaynst our ennemys, and also gyuen grace to leue the realme of Armeny in suffycient good state, shortly after, I thought for to make an ende of my vowe. And than I toke leue of the Kyng and of my kynred and frendes, and in that tyme that Our Lorde gaue vs the victory agaynst the ennemys of our fayth I toke my way and cam into Cipres. And there, into Our Lady Delepiscopie chirch of the order of Premonstrey, I toke the abyte of religion—and longe I had ben knyght in this worlde—to thyntent for to serue God the remenaunt of my lyfe. And this was in the yere of Our Lorde God M CCC v. Grace and mercy to God, for the realme of Armeny is reformed in better state than it was, by the yonge kinge, my Lorde Lynon [i.e., King Leon III]. (E2r-v, p. 60)

However, the Cypriot chroniclers always have insisted that Hetoum's sudden departure for Cyprus in 1305 was the result not of a long-held religious vow but of his seditious activities against King Hetoum II.⁹ Almost immediately on his return to Cyprus in May 1308, Hetoum proceeded to Armenia—within six days, according to Amadi.¹⁰ His return was probably a consequence of the assassination of Hetoum II the previous December.

Moreover, Hetoum's supposed retirement to a religious contemplative life in Cyprus seems not to have prevented him from being drawn into its increasingly complicated political life. The Cypriot chroniclers also accuse Hetoum of being one of the principal agents in the insurrection of Amalric of Tyre against his brother, King Henry I of Cyprus. And Hetoum's arrival in Cyprus coincides with the first secret plans made against Henry, which culminated in April 1306 with Amalric's self-appointment as governor of Cyprus (supposedly at the request of the Cypriot barons). While Kohler points out that Hetoum was not a signatory of the baronial brief accusing Henry of incapacity to govern, Hetoum's abbot was probably the "frater Bartholomeus, abbas monasterii s. Mariae de Epyra" who did sign the brief.¹¹ And Hetoum's visit to the papal court in Poitiers a year later was at least in part as an unofficial ambassador of Amalric of Tyre. Hetoum's job (as with other more official emissaries of Amalric to the papal court) was to persuade Pope Clement V (a supporter of plans for a new crusade) that Amalric was the best choice as ruler of Cyprus.

Hetoum arrived in Poitiers sometime late in 1306 and remained there at least until February 8, 1308, when he is mentioned in four papal letters,

none of which concern political matters. Nor is Hetoum referred to in them as an ambassador of Amalric; instead he is called by his Armenian title, "dominus de Curcho," or by his monastic position, "conversus monasterio sanctae Mariae de Episcopia." But a letter written between April 7 and June 4 by Raymond de Pis, papal legate to Cyprus, to Cardinal Rufati, referendary of Clement V, proves that Hetoum did play an important behind-the-scenes role on Amalric's behalf. The cardinal had authorized Raymond to collect the 10,000 florins Hetoum had offered the cardinal if he would help ensure papal recognition of Amalric's governorship. Amalric told Raymond "that he was prepared . . . to comply as far as the sum of the ten thousand florins was concerned for which I asked him in your name, and which the said lord of Curcus had promised you."¹² But Amalric refused to pay the much larger sum of 50,000 or 60,000 florins that Hetoum supposedly had offered to the cardinal on the pope's behalf. Later, when Raymond met with Hetoum in Armenia, the

same lord of Curcus talked to me several times about these matters, and I to him; and . . . he said that he had made you no promise concerning the person of our lord aforementioned [i.e., Pope Clement], but had only made a promise for ten thousand florins payable to you (and to be paid within three years by the lord of Tyre), if our lord, through your good services, would confirm the same through a letter of his in his office of government.¹³

Whatever the personal reasons for Hetoum's support for Amalric, it would also make good strategic sense from an Armenian point of view. By all accounts Amalric had played an active role in attempts to stabilize Cilician Armenia and to oppose Egyptian incursions into Syria. Furthermore, he had shown himself willing to cooperate with the Mongol ilkhans of Persia. From an Armenian point of view his belligerent tactics in Cyprus would promise an aggressive Cypriot foreign policy and future support for the beleaguered Armenian state. Hetoum's diplomatic role also suggests a political motivation, at least in part, for writing *La Fleur des histoires*. One of Pope Clement's main reasons in opposing Amalric's insurrection was that civil unrest in Cyprus would hinder the chances for a new crusade. If Hetoum could show that the lord of Tyre's party was pro-crusade and, furthermore, more likely to have the strength to actively promote one, then Clement might be more inclined to favor Amalric's cause over Henry's.

The growing urgency of the Cypriot situation and the desire for Armenian involvement in it also may have contributed to Hetoum's speedy return to Cilician Armenia in 1308. In June of that year Amalric exiled several of Henry's leading supporters to Armenia and in 1309 took the extreme measure of placing King Henry in prison there under the guard of

his brother-in-law King Oshin. It is perhaps this outright seizure of power that accounts for Amalric's vagueness about, and Hetoum's denial of, any promises of money to the pope, since the pope could hardly now recognize Amalric's blatant usurpation of his brother's throne.¹⁴ All signs point to Hetoum's resumption of an active and influential role in the political life of his country. About this time his daughter Zabel married King Oshin, successor to Leon III, and Hetoum may have resumed his position as constable of the kingdom (if he is the "Haytonus dux generalis" present at the Council of Adana in 1314).¹⁵

Not only does Falcon's insistence on papal patronage disguise the complexities of the book's relationship to Armeno-Cypriot politics, but his claim that the book is centered "vpon the passage of the Holy Land" plain and simple ignores the fact that only a small portion of *La Fleur des histoires* actually falls into the genre of *passagium*. Of its four books, the first provides a brief geographical survey of the countries of Asia; the second, a brief history of the rulers of Asia until the ascendancy of the Mongols in the thirteenth century; the third (fully half of the total work), an account of the rise of Genghis (Ghinggis) Khan and of Mongol expansion across Asia, and especially of the subsequent conflicts between the Mongol ilkhans of Persia and the Muslim sultans of Egypt; and only the fourth (a mere 20 percent of the total), a proposal for a new crusade involving the Mongols and Latin and Armenian Christians, directions for the conduct of such an expedition, and an account of recent Egyptian history.

The variety of content and narrative forms that constitutes Hetoum's actual text thus forms a loose aggregation of material often only tangentially relevant to its scribe's stated aim of a passage to the Holy Land: Geography, chronicle history, crusade propaganda, military strategy seem, at times, an uneasy fit. But the very discontinuities and unexpected conjunctions of *La Fleur des histoires* bear witness to the complexities of Hetoum's cultural location as part of a Cilician Armenian diasporic community precariously situated on the borders of European Christian, Islamic Egyptian, and Islamic Mongol empires. Nor can Hetoum's text simply be dismissed as mere crusade nostalgia and colonial mimicry from a privileged member of a Frankish-influenced, Cilician Armenian ruling class. Instead I would argue that the record of *La Fleur des histoires* suggests something more complicated: For the text's interventions into European discourses of the crusade do not simply manifest the colonial stereotype, but rather mark an innovative cross-cultural negotiation in advance of modern European colonialism and in excess of medieval European attempts at cultural hegemony.¹⁶

When members of the First Crusade entered Cappadocia and Cilicia at the end of the eleventh century, they received unexpected assistance from Christians living there. These were Armenians who, for the most part, had

drifted south and southwest from Greater Armenia after its conquest by the Seljuk Turks following the battle of Manzikert in 1071. These Armenians found refuge in the Taurus and Anti-Taurus Mountains or in the cities of the Cilician plain and northern Syria. For nearly a century after their arrival Armenians' political situation was confused and frequently precarious. Those scattered throughout the cities of Cilicia and Syria were under direct Turkish rule or under the control of semiautonomous governors of the Byzantine emperor. However, a few Armenian barons in the relative security of the Taurus and Anti-Taurus Mountains managed to preserve varying degrees of independence. By the early twelfth century two baronial families were beginning to gain ascendancy: The Hetoumids controlled the narrow western pass into Cilicia; the Roupenids, the wider eastern pass into the rich Cilician plain. While the Hetoumids remained loyal to their Byzantine overlords, the Roupenids aimed continually at the establishment of an independent Armenian kingdom in Cilicia.

Finally in 1198 Leon I, a Roupenid and a strong supporter of the Third Crusade, was crowned king, with Archbishop Conrad of Mainz, as the Holy Roman Emperor's representative, bringing the crown and bestowing the other royal insignia on Leon. At the same time the Armenian church submitted to the authority of the Western pope, although it retained its own liturgy and creed. Leon's Latin crown intensified the growing Western influence on the new Armenian kingdom and was a visible sign of Armenia's importance as one of the stronger and more vital of the Christian states in Outremer. For strategic reasons Leon also granted considerable territory in the west of Cilicia to the Hospitallers and Teutonic Knights, in order to free his forces for the struggle against Antioch and the Templars in the East. Leon also began the tradition of intermarriage between Armenians and the Frankish nobility of Outremer, most notably in 1214 with the marriage of his daughter Rita to John of Brienne, regent of the kingdom of Jerusalem.

After Leon's death in 1219, his daughter Isabel succeeded to the throne. She was quickly married to Philip, fourth son of Bohemond IV of Antioch, in the hope of maintaining internal stability and of easing tensions on the kingdom's insecure eastern border. But Philip's high-handed preference for Latin barons and the Latin ritual soon alienated his new subjects and resulted, in 1225, in his deposition and murder. Constantine of Lampron, regent and head of the rival Hetoumid clan, then married Isabel to his son Hetoum, who became king and ended a century of dynastic and territorial wrangling between the two Armenian factions. The accession of Hetoum I marks the beginning of Cilician Armenia's golden age. Throughout his reign the kingdom remained strong, free of dynastic quarrels and, for much of the time, free of foreign invasion. Armenia's ties with

the Franks widened, especially with the kingdom of Cyprus. Hetoum's sister Stephanie married Henry I of Cyprus in 1237, and his daughter, Bohemond VI of Antioch in 1254. Hetoum's brother, Sempad the Constable, translated the Assizes of Jerusalem into Armenian, thereby providing the new kingdom with a basis in Frankish feudal law.

Cilician Armenian identity, then, evidences in a variety of ways a productive and complex *métissage*.¹⁷ As a diasporic community, Cilician Armenia's point of cultural origin is Greater Armenia; however, as the only independent Armenian state, Cilicia is also the embodiment of a proud Armenian culture and history.¹⁸ But its status as an independent kingdom depends in crucial ways on a Western European and Catholic recognition of the state—the crown comes from Western emperor and pope. Moreover, this recognition is achieved and maintained (as in crucial ways is the physical security and integrity of the Cilician state) by incorporation of Armenian bodies within the regimes of European feudal law, Frankish culture (most obviously by intermarriage between the ruling classes of Cilicia and Outremer), and Western Catholicism. That this struck some parts of the Cilician Armenian ruling class as miscegenation rather than *métissage* is evident from the periodic recurrence of factional violence and civil war among them. However, for Hetoum of Korikos (and for those he admires in its history) *métissage* is a productive sign of renewal and strength—for Armenia, for Outremer, and for Europe.

But this concerted Armenian engagement with European presence in the Middle East is matched with an equally open and astute engagement with the Mongols. By 1243 the Mongol invasion of Asia had reached Asia Minor. The Mongols had conquered the Seljuk kingdom of Iconium, devastating Greater Armenia and Georgia on their way. In 1247, facing the imminent demise of his kingdom at the hands of the apparently invincible Mongols, Hetoum I sent his brother, Sempad, on an official peace mission to the Great Khan's capital of Karakorum.¹⁹ Sempad returned in 1250 with a promise of autonomy for the Armenian kingdom, but only under Mongol suzerainty. Three years later Hetoum I himself undertook the long journey across Asia to submit in person to the Great Khan Mongke. Such conditions were unacceptable to the crusader states (except for the Principality of Antioch, ruled by Hetoum's son-in-law); indeed the other crusader states roundly criticized Antioch for acknowledging Mongol authority and for joining the Armenians in fighting with these enemies of Christendom during the successful Mongol invasion of Syria and Palestine in 1260.²⁰

Any articulation of ethnic, religious, political, even geographical identity in Hetoum's text is thus complicated by the instabilities of the middle position occupied by Cilician Armenia and its ruling class. For, despite the

newness of the Cilician Armenian kingdom, Hetoum's text makes no attempt to construct a narrative of origins for a ruling house or nation, or to construct Cilician Armenia as a colonial extension of a homeland, or to use *La Fleur des histoires* as the narrative of a *translatio imperii*. This absence of a proto-Armenian nationalism or Roupenid-Lusignan dynasticism may simply reflect the status of Hetoum's book as a "Frankish" text, written by a French-speaking inhabitant of a border zone of European hegemony and directed at a "Frankish" audience interested in securing the threatened borders of Christian Europe. Certainly Hetoum's identifications as a Cilician Armenian in *La Fleur des histoire* do at times focus on that kingdom's distinctiveness vis-à-vis its immediate Islamic neighbors in Syria and Palestine and provide points of association with the Frankish crusader states, especially Antioch and Cyprus. But these identifications also show a keen awareness of Cilician Armenia's location on the margins of several great empires and its potential assimilation by different cultures and religions.

Indeed, Cilician Armenia is a curiously absent presence in Hetoum's text. The description of the realms of Asia that occupies Book One lists the historical Greater Armenia as a separate realm, and Hetoum describes his own country simply as "Silyce," the fourth "prouince" of the realm of Syria, "now called Armeny; for, syth that the enemis of the Cristen fayth had taken this lande from the Grekes handes, the Armins traueyled so moche that thei recoverd the realme of Silyce, and now the Kyng of Armeny holdeth it by the grace of God." Moreover, Syria is marked by a great diversity of peoples—"Grekes, Armins, Iacobyns, Nestorins, Sarasins, and two other nations that is Syrisins and Maroins"—as well as a variety of Christian practices—Greek Orthodox, Maronite, Jacobite, Catholic (B1v, p. 18). Cilician Armenia is even more peripheral to Book Two's account of the history of Asia (as indeed is Europe, except vicariously through the Byzantine Empire, itself a signifier of decline and increasing marginality). And even in Book Three's account of the Mongols and of recent Middle Eastern history, where Hetoum was physically present at many of the events or had access to family members who would have been, the point of view is seldom a Cilician Armenian one. Instead, the narrative emphasizes again and again the vagaries of the circulation of power. No one man, no one country, no one race, no one religion is guaranteed military victory or cultural supremacy. In this sense the instability of the Cilician Armenia kingdom (whose borders are constantly threatened and open to enemy attack and occupation) might be seen as emblematic for its apparently more powerful neighbors.

Thus, King Hetoum I, as the embodiment of the paradoxes of the Cilician Armenian perspective, provides the closest thing to a heroic subject position that might orient the narrative. *La Fleur des histoires* describes his

historic visit to Mongke Khan in highly idealized terms, and the real reason for the visit—Hetoum's potentially humiliating acceptance of Mongol overlordship in return for the Mongols' sparing his country the ravaging that had taken place elsewhere—disappears behind the ritualized account of him presenting Mongke with seven requests (conversion to Christianity, peace between Mongol and Christian, delivery of the Holy Land, destruction of the Caliph of Baghdad, Mongol military aid for Cilician Armenia, and return of any Armenian lands conquered by the Mongols) that Mongke accedes to with alacrity and goodwill.²¹ Neither Mongke nor any other Great Khan actually converted to Christianity. But the account does manage to convey the reality of Mongol religious tolerance as well as the very real strategic value of such an "alliance" for the Armenian state. Moreover, the values of diplomacy, moderation, and peaceful cooperation that this account celebrates in King Hetoum's heroism are quite different from the pursuit of personal prowess and glory that Western chivalric accounts so often emphasize and that so often proved disastrous for the crusader cause.²² Hetoum I's desire to work in concert with the Mongol Great Khan is very different from the interactions of a William of Rubrick or a European prince like Edward I, who display a will to domination and insistence on Western cultural preeminence in their interactions with the Mongols.

In *La Fleur des histoires*, Cilician Armenian métissage means that Hetoum and the imagined community he represents envisage a set of borders permeable enough that the Cilician Armenian ruling class may intermarry with the local Frankish ruling class, can be clearly conversant with French language and culture, and can accept the overlordship of the Western pope and the establishment of a Catholic Armenian church. But the same Cilician Armenians continue to be close collaborators with the non-Christian Mongols (even when they become Muslim as the ilkhans of Persia did) and remain far less dominated than Europeans by the *idea* of crusade (and with it the idea of complete cultural and religious domination) as the motivating impulse for foreign policy and alliances.

Neither does Hetoum attempt to present Armenia's Mongol allies as Europeans before the fact. His account of the rise of Genghis Khan at the beginning of Book Three of *La Fleur des histoires* tells of a knight in armor seated on a white horse coming to Genghis in a dream. The knight then tells him: "the wyll of thy immortall God is suche that he oweth to be shortli gouvernor made vpon the vii natyons of the Tartas that ben called Malgothz, and that by hym they shal be delyuerd oute of the saruage that thei had longe ben in, and shall haue worship vpon theyr neighbours." Afterward, "Cangius rose vp merily, herynge the worde of Christ and rehersed the vision that he se to all the gentilmen" (B5r, p. 26). While this story struc-

tures Mongol origins as monotheistic, pseudo-Christian, and beleaguered but for divine intervention—in other words, sufficiently like that of the crusaders to be readable by them, the tale also probably draws on a Mongol legend closely connected to fact. According to Mongol religious beliefs, a ruler could learn the will of Tengri (the ruler of heaven) only through the medium of a shaman. At the great gathering of the Mongols in 1206 that approved the election of Genghis as Great Khan, one such shaman, Kokocu Tab-tengri, claimed to have ridden up to heaven on a white horse, where he learned that Tengri had appointed Genghis as Great Khan. Hetoum may represent Genghis Khan and Mongol origins as inherently monotheistic and open to Christian arguments, but his account attempts to represent a rapprochement with, not colonization of, difference.²³ And unlike most Western observers who comment on the ugliness of Mongol's Asiatic facial appearance as a way of underscoring an often essentializing racial difference, Hetoum treats Mongol rulers in much the same way as the Europeans he describes. The moment that comes closest to such a negative Western representation of Mongol physical otherness actually works to underscore Ghazan Khan's military prowess and generosity in rewarding his men with the spoils of war: "And marueyll it was that so lytell a body myght haue so great vertu; for among a M [1000] men coud nat be so sklender a man, nor so euyl made, nor a fouler man. He surmounted all other in prowesse and vertue." Thus chivalric prowess is not imagined here as a specifically European attribute, nor is Mongol difference essentialized by such a representation of Ghazan's historical specificity.

Hetoum, then, acts as a go-between, presenting an Asia, complete with its own history, customs, religions, and peoples, to a European audience that should be interested. But he does so as one inhabiting both worlds yet not completely identified with either. And while Asia has its own integrity and continuities—where one can "know" the number and disposition of its countries and peoples—as Hetoum's own history makes apparent, ceaseless variability and change accompanies such continuity. Book Two's account of the history of Asia depicts one conqueror succeeding another, recognizing the circulation of power *tout court* rather than presenting a focused account that would establish some essential Asian character or historical otherness to Europe. Instead *La Fleur des histoires* emphasizes for its European audience the plenitudinous variety of Asia's geographic, linguistic, ethnic, religious, and cultural diversity. By implication, no one nation or ruler, no one religion will ever completely dominate it; hence the value of such knowledge in order to allow strategic intervention and alliance of Western and Asian forces. Similarly, Hetoum's descriptions of Islamic forces in Syria and Egypt at times draw on the language of Christian vituperation and otherness. But for the most part these Muslims are singled out for

hatred because they are the *tactical* enemies of Armenia, and for this reason different from Muslim allies such as the Mongol ilkhans of Persia. It is thus necessary to pay attention to multiple differences in order to find security in such a complex landscape; simple binaries will not work. Hetoum's book, then, with its mixture of forms of knowledge, attunement to all points of the compass, and attention to the telling differences between peoples, chronicles the need to know the actualities of the lay of the land around one, to appreciate as many points of view as possible. Perhaps because there could be no one, transcendent point of view that marked a coherent, unified Cilician Armenian identity, Hetoum's narrative seems less concerned with chronicling in its history or charting in its geography a fixed, transcendent signifier, such as *Christianitas* or Europe.

Thus the explicit aim of Hetoum's fourth book may be to persuade the pope to lead a new crusade to the Holy Land and to provide useful practical information for the best way to conduct such a venture. But Hetoum's interest implicitly harnesses a European crusade ideology to "Eastern" tactical needs, focusing on the means by which significant external resources can be harnessed for the defence and security of the Cypriot and Armenian kingdoms. Moreover, this final section is a relatively small portion of a text largely given over to *Asian* concerns; most of the work focuses on a geography of Asia and a history of its rulers (in which recent Mongol and Egyptian history—and by extension, that of the crusader states—are but the latest instalment). In other words, Hetoum's propagandizing might be seen as much an attempt to change the European worldview, to realign it geopolitically, as an attempt to whip up European crusading spirit against a monolithic Oriental other.

Implicitly, Hetoum's text maps Jerusalem as one destination among many, sees it in a geographical context quite different from the usual European one: on the periphery of Asia, *strategically*, not *conceptually*, in the center of Egyptian, Mongol, Frankish, Armenian geopolitical interests. This Jerusalem therefore does not define a whole and originary *Christianitas* (and with it a supreme Latin Europe) by acting as mirror and *translatio*. In a more "standard" crusade or travel account from a European perspective, in "naturally" ending in Jerusalem one thereby proves who one truly is, that is, a Christian subject, and proclaims the centrality of that "I" and the inherent superiority of its point of view.²⁴ Hetoum's methodology is metonymic rather than metaphoric, a bringing close together into productive contiguity a variety of differences rather than a process of othering in order to define some crucial foundational difference. His Asia thus becomes a productive place of contiguity rather than orientalizing spectacle, part of the multiplicity of crosscultural identifications that *La Fleur des histoires* inscribes and encourages.

Notes

1. See *Recueil des historiens des croisades: Documents Arméniens*, vol. 2, ed. C. Kohler (Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1906; reprinted Farnborough, England: Gregg, 1967), lxxxv-cxxxi, for detailed descriptions of the manuscript copies and printed editions of Hetoum's texts and their translations. Kohler's is the only modern edition of the French and Latin texts and is based on a collation of thirteen French and eight Latin manuscripts. Kohler argues that Book IV of *La Fleur des histoires* was not part of the first French version of the text but was added as part of the Latin text prepared at the request of Pope Clement V and only later translated into French and added to the original three books (lxi-lxvii).
2. Five manuscript copies of the Le Long collection survive: listed by M. C. Seymour, *Mandeville's Travels* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 277-78.
3. See Kohler, *Recueil des historiens*, cxxii-cxxvii, for a summary of these early printed editions. Numerous manuscript and print translations also testify to the text's continuing popularity throughout the late medieval and early modern period. A Spanish manuscript translation—*La Flor de la Ystorias de Orient*—was commissioned in the late fourteenth century by a grand master of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem (ed. Wesley Robertson Long [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934]). Two Tudor English translations—one manuscript (Royal 18.B.xxvi); the other, printed by Pynson—were produced before 1520. Books I and II of *La Fleur des histoires* were translated into English again in 1625 and included in Samuel Purchas's collection of travel texts titled *Haklvytus Posthumus, or Purchas his Pilgrimes*. There were also numerous translations into the other major European languages published in the sixteenth century: German (1534), Italian (1556, 1562 [twice]), Spanish (1595), Dutch (1563, and three more times in the late seventeenth century). Ironically, *La Fleur des histoires* was not translated into Armenian until 1842, as *History of the Tartars*, trans. Br. P. Mkrtitch [Jean-Baptiste Aucher] (Venice: Imprimerie de Saint-Lazare, 1842). See Kohler, cxxviii-cxxx.
4. G3v, p. 85. References to *La Fleur des histoires* (hereafter included in the text) are given first by folio number (as above) in Richard Pynson's sixteenth-century English translation (which can be found on STC microfilm, *Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640*, No. 13256), and then by page number in *A Lytell Cronycle: Richard Pynson's Translation (c1520) of "La Fleur des histoires de la terre d'Orient" (c1307)*, ed. Glenn Burger (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988).
5. Thus any crusading endeavor included "foreign" European crusaders present for the limited duration of a given military action, members of the crusading orders (Hospitallers, Teutonic Knights, Templars) permanently based in the Middle East, and knights drawn from the Christian states of Outremer—the latter divided between a state like Cyprus (or

earlier, Antioch or Jerusalem) containing "native" populations (of Greeks, Jews, Armenians, Muslims, etc.) ruled by Frankish elites and a state like Cilician Armenia (with a diverse population ruled by a "native" Christian elite heavily but not completely Frankicized).

6. As Hetoum's text makes clear, at least six different Christianities coexist in the East: (Roman) Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Armenian (with an Armenian Catholic Church in Cilician Armenia), Maronite, Nestorian, and Jacobite. Non-Christian forces included the Islamic Arabic states in Egypt and Syria as well as the different Mongol states (variously shamanistic, Buddhist, Islamic, and Christian leaning).
7. This makes him a firsthand observer of many of the events he describes and allows him, for earlier material, to draw on the experience of his uncles, the great King Hetoum I and Sempad the Constable, both of whom visited the courts of Mongol great khans.
8. Hetoum probably did not assume the title "Lord of Korikos" until after the death of his brother Gregorios (around 1280). About this time, Hetoum married his Cypriot cousin, Isabel of Ibelin. At least six children resulted from the marriage, a daughter, Zabel, becoming the wife of King Oshin I of Cilician Armenia and a son, Oshin, regent during the minority of King Leon IV. See Count William Henry Rüd̄t-Collenberg, *The Rupenides, Hetumites and Lusignans: The Structure of the Armeno-Cilician Dynasties* (Paris: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation Armenian Library, 1963), table III, after p. 48.
9. See *Chronique d'Amadi*, ed. René de Mas Latrie, in *Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France*, Première Série (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1891). An earlier instance of piety on Hetoum's part is also open to varied interpretation. In a version of the third book of *La Fleur des histoires* found in only one French and eight Latin manuscripts, Hetoum tells of a pilgrimage he made "apud Vallem Viridem" (probably to France between 1297 and 129—see Kohler, *Receuil des historiens*, p. 330). This pilgrimage also took place during a time of civil strife and dynastic struggle in Cilician Armenia. And here too Hetoum's pilgrimage might have been a disguise for a diplomatic mission (to add his voice to those urging a new crusade, to shape papal intervention in Armenian politics, or as a polite term for an enforced exile). Kohler finds support for this accusation in the suppression by Hetoum in *La Fleur des histoires* of any direct reference to King Hetoum II and in Hetoum's passionate support of the young king Leon III (xxxvii-xxxviii). For discussions of Cilician Armenian politics during this period, see Serap̄ie Der Nersessian, "The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia," in *A History of the Crusades*, gen. ed. Kenneth M. Setton, vol. 2, *The Later Crusades*, ed. Robert Lee Wolff and Harry H. Hazard (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1962), pp. 630-60; *The Cilician Kingdom of Armenia*, ed. T. S. R. Boase (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978), pp. 28-33; Fr. H. François Tourn̄bize, *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arm̄nie* (Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1910); *The Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 4, part 1, *Byzan-*

tium and Its Neighbours, ed. J. M. Hussey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), pp. 628–37.

10. *Chronique d'Amadi*, ed. Latrie, p. 280.
11. Kohler, *Recueil des historiens*, xxxix and note 3; "Epyra" is likely a misreading for "Episcopia."
12. "Paratus erat . . . usque ad summam decem milium florinorum per me ab ipso, vestro nomine, petitam et per dictum dominum de Curco vobis promissam complacere"; Vatican Archives *Instrumenta Miscellanea*, No. 484; printed in Charles Perrat, "Un Diplomate gascon au XIV^e siècle: Raymond de Piis, nonce de Clément V en orient," *Mélange d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, 44th year (1927): 73.
13. "Idem dominus de Curco pluries super hiis fuit mihi locutus et ego secum; et . . . diceret quod nullam promissionem personam dicti domini nostri contingentem vobis fecerat, nisi solum de decem milibus florinis vobis dandis et in tribus annis solvendis per dominum Tirensem, so idem dominus noster eidem officium gubernationis, vobis procurante, per suas litteras confirmaret" (Vatican Archives *Instrumenta Miscellanea*, No. 484).
14. For discussions of Cypriot history in this period, see Peter W. Edbury, *The Kingdom of Cyprus and the Crusades, 1191–1374* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 101–40; Setton, *History of the Crusades*, vol. 3, *The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, ed. Harry W. Hazard (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1975).
15. If this is so, then he was certainly dead by 1320 when his son Oshin, now lord of Korikos, became regent, for no mention is made of Hetoum's presence.
16. I have avoided using the term "multicultural" to describe any of the mixed cultural situations that Hetoum found himself in or attempts to describe in his book. Instead, I would argue, we need to distinguish between three different situations: (1) crosscultural contact, such as that obtaining between Cilician Armenia and the Mongols (especially the ilkhans of Persia); (2) métissage, such as the blending of Frankish and Armenian culture that characterized the Cilician Armenian ruling class during Hetoum's time; and (3) what I would call the polyculturalism that one finds in Syria, with its diverse "communities" of different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds living in often harmonious but bounded relationship to each other.
17. I emphasize métissage over diaspora in defining the ruling class of Cilician Armenia because, from Leon I onward, actual intermarriage with the Frankish nobility of Outremer is the foundation for a wider mixing of legal, social, linguistic, military, and religious forms with the Frankish West. What is produced, I am arguing through the case of Hetoum and *La Fleur des histoires*, is a set of identifications not strictly Western or Eastern, Armenian or Frankish—in short, the situation of the métis.
18. Kirakos of Ganjak, for example, describes in glowing terms the reception by King Hetoum I of Armenian dignitaries while on a visit to Greater

Armenia: "He received them all with love, for he was a gentle man, wise and learned in the Scriptures. And he gave them presents in accordance with his means and sent them all away happy: he also gave sacerdotal robes for the adornment of the churches, for he greatly loved mass and the church. He received the Christians of all nations and besought them to live in love with one another, as brothers and members of Christ, even as the Lord had commanded." See J. A. Boyle, "The Journey of Het'um I, King of Little Armenia, to the Court of the Great Khan Möngke," *Central Asiatic Journal* 9 (1964): 186; reprinted as No. X in Boyle, *The Mongol World Empire 1206-1370* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1977).

19. Sempad described some of his experiences during this visit in a letter to King Henry I of Cyprus: see *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. Martin Bouquet et al., vol. 10 (Paris, 1840; reprinted, Farnborough, England: Gregg, 1967), pp. 361-63; and Sir Henry Yule, *Cathay and the Way Thither*, rev. H. Cordier, vol. 1, The Hakluyt Society Second Series, No. 38 (London, 1913), pp. 162, 262-63.
20. See Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954), pp. 307, 311-12. It was not until twenty years later, when the situation in the Holy Land had grown more desperate and when Abaga, Mongol ilkhān of Persia, had dropped the demand for suzerainty, that the possibility of a general alliance between Mongols and the West could be considered seriously (notably by Edward I of England during his crusade of 1271). The mediation of Cilician Armenians between the Mongols and Europeans and the Armenians' firsthand experience of alliance with the Mongols must have been an important factor in developing this European openness to some limited rapprochement with the Mongols.
21. Kirakos of Ganjak, in his account of the meeting, mentions only the guarantee of Hetoum's lands and the promise of religious freedom for all Christians living under the Mongols. See Boyle, "Journey of Het'um I," 181.
22. Lee Patterson notes that chivalry's "deepest ambition was to produce not a better world but a perfect knight. It was committed to codes of behavior not as programs of action but techniques of self-fashioning: the chivalric life was its own goal. . . . Hence the insistence throughout chivalric writing on the simplicity of chivalric selfhood. Chivalric heroes are represented as driven by a single, all-compelling desire. Peter of Cyprus is inspired by a youthful vision to found the Order of the Sword, 'and this was the goal of all his efforts.' Geoffroi de Charny, a preeminent chevalier who died defending his king's *oriflamme* at Poitiers, tells us in his authoritative *Livre de Chevalerie* that the youths who will become successful soldiers are those who have haunted the *mestier d'armes* from their earliest days and are driven solely by the desire 'to have the high honor of prowess.' . . . Machaut, for example, explains Peter of Cyprus's adoption of the sword as an emblem of his crusading order in these terms: 'For when an eminent prince

conquers by the sword, he acquires glory—honor and profit together—and a good name.” Patterson, *Chaucer and the Subject of History* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), pp. 175–76.

23. See Mouradja d'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols depuis Tchinguiz-Khan jusqu'à Timor Bey ou Tamerlan*, vol. 1 (The Hague: Van Cleef, 1834), pp. 98–100; and R. P. Lister, *The Secret History of Genghis Khan* (P. Davies: London, 1969), pp. 191–95.
24. See Iain Higgins, “Defining the Earth’s Center in a Medieval ‘Multi-Text’: Jerusalem in *The Book of John Mandeville*,” in *Text and Territory Geographic Imagination in the European Middle Ages*, ed. Sylvia Tomasch and Sealy Gilles (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), pp. 29–53, for a discussion both of the tradition of Jerusalem as the centre of the world in some Western medieval *mappaemundi* and of the complexity with which such a concept actually plays out in a travel narrative such as *Mandeville’s Travels*. Because Jerusalem is so often conceived as this originary point, pilgrimages “ended” with the arrival in Jerusalem. As a result, as Donald Howard has pointed out, the pilgrimage account of Friar Felix Fabri from the end of the fifteenth century is a rarity in dwelling on the return journey and the homecoming: “most writers barely mention it, and some do not at all. The same is true of ‘voyages.’” *Writers and Pilgrims: Medieval Pilgrimage Narratives and Their Posterity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), pp. 46–47. In addition, a text like *Godfrey of Bouillon* “romances” crusade history so that Godfrey’s identity as knight (and by extension, the identities of the other crusaders) is fulfilled by the conquest of Jerusalem and his coronation as its first Christian king. But such an ending also fantasizes the successful crusade as ending history, signalling a fulfilling stasis that colonizes not only Islamic/Christian difference but also those between Eastern and Western Christianity and between a Christian present and Jewish past. See William Caxton, *Godfrey of Boloyne*, ed. M. N. Colvin, Early English Text Society Extra Series 64 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1893; reprinted 1987); see also another English translation even more focused on Godfrey as romance hero in BL MS Royal 18.B.xxvi, folios 6v–86v.



AN ARMENIAN BIBLIOLOGY

Author(s): Sirarpi Der Nersessian

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Traditio*, Vol. 16 (1960), pp. 419-424

Published by: [Fordham University](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27830417>

Accessed: 21/01/2013 13:09

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Fordham University is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Traditio*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES

AN ARMENIAN BIBLIOLOGY

Students of Early Christian and Medieval civilizations have long been aware of the need for comprehensive and reliable bibliographies. This need has been felt even more keenly by those who are primarily interested in the East Christian world, for information on either primary sources or critical studies is too often scattered in books and periodicals which are not easily available even in large libraries. The recent publication by Hakob S. Anasian of the first volume of his *Armenian Bibliology*¹ is a major event for these studies and deserves to be called to the attention of all medievalists. I wish to express here my thanks to the editors of *Traditio* who, realizing the significance of this publication, accepted the present article although it has been their general policy not to include book reviews in their journal.

The *Armenian Bibliology* is to consist of ten volumes containing information on all Armenian authors, Armenian translations of foreign writers, and anonymous writings from the fifth to the eighteenth century. It seems probable that, when completed, the estimated ten volumes will not be sufficient, for the first volume does not even cover the entire first letter of the alphabet, but includes only the names from A to Ar.

In the long Introduction the author explains the scope and plan of his work. His aim has been to give more than a purely factual and systematic description of books and notices of different editions, in effect, a critical study which deals with the contents of the works that are listed; that is why he has entitled his book a 'bibliology' rather than a 'bibliography.'

After outlining the plan followed in the articles, and which I shall summarize below, the author has included in his Introduction, all bibliographic indications which are to be found in the works of medieval Armenian writers. These comprise such indications as the lists of apocryphal or 'forbidden books' given by the historian Samuel of Ani in the twelfth century, or by Mekhit'ar of Ayrivank' in the fourteenth century; or lists of Armenian historians, or of authors of Armenian hymns given by other medieval writers. In each case Anasian has indicated the manuscripts which provide the basis for a critical edition of these lists, and in one or two instances he has himself made valuable corrections or additions.

This section is followed by an imposing list of 178 catalogues of Armenian manuscripts, and publications of colophons of manuscripts, a list which includes both published catalogues and unpublished ones deposited at the Library of Erevan. At the end of the volume there is an index of *incipits* (col. 1189-1228). This is a very useful addition, for, as is well known to all students of Early Christian literature, the same text or homily is sometimes attributed to different

¹ H. S. Anasian, *Haykakan matenagidowl'yown*: Vol. I, A to Arak'el Saladsorets'i (Erevan 1959) xcv pp. + 1228 cols. in-4°. (In Armenian, with Russian title: *Armianskaia bibliologiia*. V-XVIIIvv. Akademiia nauk Armianskoi SSR. Institut istorii).

authors, and it is only by the help of such indices that one can hope to bring together the scattered source materials.

The plan followed for the bibliographical notices is the following. The articles are listed in alphabetical order by the author's name; or by the title, for anonymous works, for instance the Assizes of Antioch; or under general headings such as Alphabets, Apocrypha, and so forth. Each article begins with brief information about the author or the given text, and a general bibliography on the subject; whenever necessary there is a summary of different opinions expressed in critical studies. This is followed by a list of the author's works, giving each time both the title and the *incipit*; the different editions are given in chronological order with the indication of the manuscripts used for these editions, whenever this information is available, and adding a list of other manuscripts in which that particular text is to be found. In compiling this list, the author has consulted not only all published catalogues of manuscripts, but he has also made use of unpublished catalogues deposited in the library of Erevan (the *Matenadaran*). What is even more useful, he has systematically explored the rich collection of manuscripts of the *Matenadaran*; the indications he has thus furnished are most valuable, for only a small part of the manuscripts which were originally at Etchmiadzin were catalogued in summary fashion, and moreover with numerous errors.²

For unpublished texts, Anasian has attempted to indicate the most reliable manuscript, selected preferably from among those at Erevan which he could consult personally. In several instances he has described the contents or given a list of chapters, and he has reproduced informative passages from the colophons.

The translations into modern Armenian or into a foreign language are next listed and for those texts which are themselves translated from Greek, Syriac, Arabic or Latin there is always a reference to the standard publications in the original language. Finally, at the end of each article, there is a full and up-to-date bibliography of critical studies published in different languages on the author or on the Armenian versions; these are listed in alphabetical order by the name of the author of the critical study. Thus one can find all the available information necessary for future studies.

For medievalists and Church historians who are not primarily concerned with Armenian literature two groups of entries are of prime importance: first, the translations of Greek, Syriac, Arabic and Latin works; second, the lives of saints. I shall limit my remarks to these two categories. As is well known, Armenian translations made in the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries, as well as in later periods, have contributed to our knowledge of the literary products of the early centuries of our era. It is through these that we have sometimes come to know works the originals of which are lost. One may mention, amongst many other examples, Saint Ephrem's Commentary on the Diatessaron; the Chronicon of Eusebius; the Refutation of the Doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon by Timothy Aelurus, Patriarch of Alexandria; or Philo's Commentaries on Genesis and Exodus, and his treatises on Providence and Animals. Even when the originals are preserved, the testimony of the Armenian versions is valuable, for, at times, they have retained an earlier or better redaction than the one known through

² Y. Kareniants', *General Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of the Holy See of Etchmiadzin* (in Armenian; Tiflis 1863).

the Greek manuscripts. This was recently pointed out, for instance, for the treatise of Hippolytus of Rome on the Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses.³

Until now the standard reference work for Armenian versions of ancient authors was G. Zarbhanalian's *Catalogue des anciennes traductions arméniennes, siècles V-XIII* (Venice 1889; in Armenian, with French title). This survey is still useful, but it has a major weakness, common to many works published at the time; the author, while referring to manuscripts, did not specify their provenance. This failure was partly obviated by J. Muylderman's *Répertoire de pièces patristiques d'après le catalogue arménien de Venise*,⁴ in which he listed the Armenian versions of Greek, Syriac and Latin texts included in the second volume of the Catalogue of the Mekhitharist Library in Venice-San Lazzaro, which was published without an index. Catalogues of other Armenian manuscripts are fortunately provided with an index, but many collections are still only partially catalogued and important manuscripts remain virtually unknown. As mentioned above, Anasian has not only listed all manuscripts known through catalogues, but he has added references culled from unpublished catalogues and especially from the rich collection of the *Matenadaran* at Erevan. He has thus been able to call attention to versions which hitherto were not known, or were imperfectly known. For instance, under the heading of Acacius of Melitene, we find in addition to his correspondence with the catholicos Saint Sahak, already known and published, the indication of an Armenian version of his homily delivered at the Council of Ephesus, preserved in two manuscripts of Erevan, nos. 2620 and 3830.⁵ Anasian has also found in MSS 1982, 3295, and 4425 of Erevan a fragment from another homily which begins with the words: 'For the true incarnation of Christ.' To the three manuscripts of Erevan he has added, with reason, a reference to Vaticanus Borgianus 31, fol. 132. The name of the author had been misread by the author of the catalogue, as Arak (?) and translated as Heraclius; this should be corrected to Akak (Acacius).⁶ Another example of hitherto unknown texts, in this case short passages, may be seen under the heading of Ambrose of Milan (col. 640-642), where we find four excerpts from his writings in addition to the three already listed by Muyldermans.

More important is the notice on Alexander, patriarch of Alexandria, the opponent of Arius, very few of whose writings have survived in Greek (col. 550-553). According to Epiphanius, there existed a collection of his Encyclical letters numbering seventy, but only two, preserved in the histories of Theodoret and Socrates, are known in full.⁷ We now learn, for the first time, that separate Armenian versions of these letters exist in Erevan, MS 2620, fol. 8-17v;⁸ excerpts from the longer letter are also to be found in two other manuscripts of Erevan, MS 500 (fol. 283) and MS 4188 (p. 51). The homilies of Alexander are even less

³ PO 27 (1954) viii, xxii.

⁴ *Le Muséon* 47 (1934) 265-292.

⁵ See col. 490. Anasian gives the references to Hardouin's and Mansi's editions of the Acts of the Councils, as well as to Migne, PG 77.1467-1472.

⁶ E. Tisserant, *Codices Armeni Bibliothecae Vaticanae: Borgiani, Vaticani, Barberiniani, Chisiani* (Rome 1927) 52.

⁷ Berthold Altaner, *Patrologie* (Freiburg 1950) I 229.

⁸ For the Greek texts cf. PG 18,572-577, 548-572.

well known. One, *De anima et corpore deque passione Domini*, exists in Syriac and Coptic, and there are Syriac fragments of other homilies.⁹ To these Oriental versions one can now add several Armenian excerpts preserved in MS 2679 of Erevan (fol. 222^v-226 or 224^v-228); these excerpts are different from the passages quoted by Timothy Aelurus.

Interesting information will be found under the heading Albertus Magnus (col. 388-402). The *Compendium theologicæ veritatis* which, as modern scholarship has shown, was written by Hugo Ripelin of Strassburg, is known in Armenian as the 'Albert Book.' The Armenian translation, made in 1344 by the Dominican Peter of Aragon and the Armenian monk, Yakobos *vardapet*, was published in Venice in 1715 by the abbot Mekhit'ar, the founder of the Mekhitharist congregation, and studied recently by M. A. van den Oudenrijn, O.P.¹⁰ To the list of manuscripts given by the latter several others can now be added and on the basis of these it will be possible to determine the character and extent of the changes avowedly made by Abbot Mekhit'ar in his edition. In the colophon added by Peter of Aragon and Yakobos *vardapet* to the 'Albert Book,' they state that they translated it anew (*verstin*). Anasian has found in MS 725 of Erevan a different recension of the entire Book IV, and he has reproduced a passage from chapter 8 for purposes of comparison (col. 400). This hitherto unknown version may well be the earlier translation referred to by Peter of Aragon and Yakobos *vardapet*, and the confrontation of the two texts may explain why a revision was needed or was thought desirable. The majority of medieval Latin theological writings were translated into Armenian after 1330, when the Dominican Bartholomew, bishop of Maragha, went to the monastery of K'rna, which became the center of the Armenian *Fratres Unitores*. But we know of at least one translation made prior to this date. The Commentary of Saint Thomas Aquinas on the Fourth Book of Sentences by Peter Lombard was translated in 1321 at the monastery of Tsortsor by Yovhannes of Erzuka, also called Tsortsorets'i, with the assistance of a priest Bartholomew who appears to be a different person from Bartholomew of Bologna.¹¹ The first translation of the 'Albert Book,' either entirely or in part, may have been made about the same date.

Among the manuscripts of Erevan, Anasian has also found an abridged version of Albert the Great's *De secretis mulierum*. He gives the contents of MS 4607, where the eleven books are followed by the *De physiognomia et de hominis procreatione* of Michael Scot (or Scott), sometimes attributed to Albertus Magnus. The *De secretis mulierum* is also included in Cod. 31 of the State Museum of Tiflis and in a manuscript which before 1915 was in the Armenian monastery of Ankara, known as the Red Monastery. On the basis of the description given in the catalogue prepared before 1915, Anasian believes that the manuscript of the Red Monastery may also have contained an abridged version of *De virtutibus herbarum, lapidum et animalium quorundam*. None of these Armenian

⁹ B. Altaner, *op. cit.* 229. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1912) III 35-36.

¹⁰ M. A. van den Oudenrijn, O.P., 'Das « Buch Albert » in der armenischen Literatur,' *Divus Thomas* 18 (1940) 428-448.

¹¹ M. A. van den Oudenrijn, O.P., 'Uniteurs et Dominicains d'Arménie,' *Oriens Christianus* 40 (1956) 96; see notes 3-5 for references to the Armenian sources.

versions has been published and, to my knowledge, this is the first time that they are brought to the attention of scholars.

Of the Greek Church Fathers included in this first volume, the most important is Athanasius of Alexandria. Twenty-four pages (col. 321-368) are devoted to the Armenian versions of his works; these are grouped under separate headings, according to their contents, giving each time full references to manuscripts, editions and critical studies. The majority of the Armenian versions were published in Venice in 1899, but there are still some unpublished texts which are worth mentioning, even though they may prove to be spurious works. These texts are the following: in Erevan, MS 1408, seven homilies which are commentaries on the Catholic Epistles of James, Peter, John and Jude (col. 360-361); in Erevan, MS 4618, a text entitled, 'Against those who say that it is by God's command that man does evil and good' (col. 339, no. 9); in Erevan, MS 4188, a long passage on the Holy Spirit from the 'Profession of Faith' (col. 341, no. 13).

In the bibliography I have noted only one major omission, namely the publication by Robert P. Casey, *The Armenian Version of the Pseudo-Athanasian Letter to the Antiochenes and of the Expositio Fidei* (Studies and Documents 15; London-Philadelphia 1947). Casey's study was based on MSS 629 and 648 of the Mekhitharist Library of Vienna, the only ones in which he had found this text. To these two we can now add MS 2196 of Erevan, mentioned by Anasian, which contains a major part of the same text. In the bibliographical notices of the works of Athanasius, one should also mention an article by J. Lebon, 'Pour une édition critique des œuvres de S. Athanase,' *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 21 (1925) 524-530. Lebon stresses the importance of the Oriental versions, in particular of the Armenian version of *De Incarnatione et contra Arianos*, which should be taken into consideration in the discussions concerning the authenticity of this text.

The second group of entries of general interest to medievalists comprises the hagiographic texts. The Armenian versions listed in the *Bibliotheca hagiographica Orientalis* are based on the collections of Lives of Saints published before 1910. Since then the Synaxarium known as that of Ter Israel has been published, with a French translation, in the *Patrologia Orientalis*, providing us with many more, though brief, biographies. Anasian has also included references to the Synaxarium of Grigor Tserents' as well as to what seem to be unpublished versions. One should, however, proceed with some caution in regard to the latter, for the *incipits* which are used as a basis for determining different recensions are not always a sufficiently reliable guide. A case in point is the *Vita* of 'Abd al-Masil, a Jew converted to the Christian faith and martyred in Persia in the fourth century. Anasian has grouped the texts according to their *incipits* and listed them as versions 1, 2 and 3 (col. 41-42). But if we compare the *incipit* of version 3 with version 2, which has been printed in full in the Venice edition of 1874, we find that after a fairly long introductory paragraph in the latter, the beginning of the actual *Vita* hardly differs from the *incipit* of version 3.¹² It would seem, therefore, that we have the same recension and the minor differences in wording are of a type which frequently occurs in hagiographic texts. Anasian's version 1 begins with the words: 'All those who have truly believed in Christ and followed the teachings of the Holy Gospel...'

¹² *Lives and Martyrdoms of Saints* (in Armenian; Venice 1874) I 7.

(col. 41). The rest of the sentence is not given, but these opening words suggest an introductory paragraph and the *Vita* itself may not be different. Only the confrontation of the complete texts can show whether or not there are significant variations, but one's doubts are aroused by the fact that the manuscripts grouped under versions 1 and 3 have exactly the same information in the colophon, and state that the life of 'Abd al-Masil was translated from the Syriac into Armenian in 873, by order of Gurgen Artsruni (col. 41 n. 2; col. 42 n. 1).

In another instance as well, namely the life of Antigonus Romanus and Eupraxia, one may wonder whether this redaction differs from the life of Eupraxia listed as version 2 (col. 931-932). These are, however, minor criticisms and one could naturally not expect the author of the *Bibliology* to have read and compared with one another all the hagiographic texts. Even if further studies should lead to different conclusions, what is important is that in each case Anasian has given the detailed information which will enable such studies. Already the *Vitae* included in this first volume constitute a valuable supplement to the *Bibliotheca hagiographica Orientalis*, all the more so as references are given to the manuscripts as well as to published lives. Among those which, to my knowledge, have not yet been included among the Armenian versions, one may mention a fairly long account of the Martyrdom of Alexander of Rome and of Theodulus. This text occurs in two manuscripts of Erevan: MS 1522, fol. 71-74^v; MS 3777, fol. 141-144. The beginning of this *Vita* corresponds, as Anasian has pointed out, to the fourth chapter of the Latin text in *Acta Sanctorum*, Maius I (Paris and Rome 1866) 378.

The above survey of some of the sections of the *Armenian Bibliology* will give an idea of its vast scope and importance. One is truly amazed that it could have been undertaken by a single person and carried out in such great detail, extending the research into unpublished materials. Throughout his work, the author has applied the most rigorous methods of modern scholarship and provided specialists in different disciplines with a model reference book. Besides being a major contribution for the advancement of Armenian studies, this book is of signal value to medieval historians, to students of patristics and hagiography.

Dumbarton Oaks.

SIRARPIE DER NERSESSIAN